arXiv:math/0112238v1 [math.LO] 21 Dec 2001

LONG ITERATIONS
FOR THE CONTINUUM
SH707

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Abstract. We deal with an iteration theorem of forcing notion with a kind of countable support of nice enough forcing notion which is proper $\aleph_2$-c.c. forcing notions. We then look at some special cases ($\mathbb{Q}_D$'s preceded by random forcing).

Anotated content

§0 Introduction

§1 Trunk Controller

[We define "trunk controller" which will serve as the "apure", not a name of a kind of CS iteration. We define standard; what is being based and fully based on $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ (at in Definition 1.1). Also we define simple, semi-simple, semi-simply based on (Definition 1.2). We then define an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ (1.6), being clear, basic, straight $\mathscr{F}$-clear and weakly clear (Definition 1.7). We define $\mathscr{F}$-iteration (1.9). We then prove some basic claims. Lastly, we define (θ, σ)-pure decidability.]

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
Partially supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation
Latest Revision - 01/Oct/9
First version written 99/10;§9;done 98/10 and §10 - 12/99

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

§2 Being $\mathscr{F}$-pseudo c.c.c. is preserved by $\mathscr{F}$-iterations

[We define $\mathscr{F}$-psc, condition guaranteeing $\aleph_1$ is not collapsed, an explicit form of properness and variants (2.1,2.2,2.9,2.6) give sufficient conditions (2.5,2.7). We give sufficient conditions for pure decidability in claim 2.9. We prove if $\bar{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration then $\text{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ is a $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing (+ variants, in Lemma 2.12). Give a definition of witnesses for c.c.c. by sets of pairs.]

§3 Nicer pure properness and pure decidability

[We return to condition for pure properness (claim 3.1).]

§4 Averages by an ultrafilter and restricted non null trees

[We consider the relationships of a (non principal) ultrafilter D on ω and subtrees T of ${}^{\omega>}2$ which positive Lebesgue measure, considering $T = \text{Lim}_D\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$. We concentrate on the case of the rate of convergence of T and T_n to their measure is bounded from above a function g from a family $\mathscr{G} \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\omega$ of reasonable candidates.]

§5 On $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ and iterations

§6 On a relative of Borel conjecture with large $\mathfrak{b}$

§7 Continuing [Sh 592]

§8 On "η is R-big over M"

[We generalize the "η is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over M", to "η is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M". So "$\eta \in \lim T$" is replaced by $(\eta, \nu) \in R \subseteq {}^{\omega}2 \times {}^{\omega}2$.]

§0 Introduction

This is a modest try to investigate iterations $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ which increase the continuum arbitrarily. The support is countable, but defining $p \le q$, only for finitely many $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$ we are allowed to fail to have pure extension. More explicitly for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}_\alpha$, has a "trunk" $\mathrm{tr}(p)$, the apure part, and we demand that $\langle tr(p(\alpha)) : \alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)\rangle$ is an "old" element, i.e. a function from $\mathbf{V}$. In this context we have a quite explicit form of properness which guaranteed $\aleph_1$ is not collapsed. Assuming CH there are reasonable conditions guaranteeing the $\aleph_2$-c.c.

We may be more liberal in the first step of the iteration. We then concentrate on more specific content. We let $\mathbb{Q}_0$ be Random_A, adding a sequence of random reals $\langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_\gamma : \gamma \in A\rangle$, and each $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = Q_{1+\beta}$ is $\mathbb{Q}_{\underset{\sim}{\bar{D}}_\alpha}, \underset{\sim}{\bar{D}}_\alpha = \langle \underset{\sim}{D}^\alpha_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega\rangle, \underset{\sim}{D}^\alpha_\eta$ a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-anme of a non principal ultrafilter on ω. However, for the results we have in mind, $\underset{\sim}{D}^\alpha_\eta$ should satisfy some special properties: in the direction of being a Ramsey ultrafilter. If $\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathrm{Random}_\lambda$, we may try to demand that for every $r \in \mathbf{V}^{\lim(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})}$, for more $\beta < \lambda, \underset{\sim}{\nu}_\beta$ is random over $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{r}]$. We do not know to do it, but if we can restrict ourselves to measure 1 set of the form $\cup \lim(T^{<n>}), T$ a subtree of ${}^{\omega >}2$ with the fastness of convergence of $\langle |2^n \cap T|/2^{-n} : n < \omega\rangle$ to $\mathrm{Leb}(\lim(T))$ by $g \in \mathbf{V}$, moreover this holds above any $\eta \in {}^{\omega >}2$. This is a "poor relative" of the "Borel conjecture + $\mathfrak{b}$ large".

The method seems to me more versatile than the method of first forcing whatever and then forcing with the random algebra. Note that:

We lastly deal with relative of [Sh 592].

§1 Trunk Controllers

The reader may in 1.1(2) use $\zeta \le 1$, use only the fully based case, and ignore 1.16 (associativity).

1.1 Definition. : 1) A trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is a set or a class with quasi-orders $\le = \le^{\mathscr{F}}$ (which we denote also by $\le_{us}$) and $\le_{\rm pr} = \le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\rm pr}$ and $\le_{\rm apr} = \le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\rm apr}$ such that:

(*a*) $\le_{\rm pr} \subseteq \le$ and $\le_{\rm apr} \subseteq \le$.

2) We define the $(\bar\alpha, X, \zeta)$-standard trunk controller $\mathscr{F} = \mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\zeta}[X]$ in $\mathbf{V}$ by induction on $\zeta \le \omega_1$, where $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \le \zeta \rangle, \alpha_\varepsilon$ an ordinal and X is a trunk controller, but we may write $\bar\alpha'$ with $\bar\alpha' \restriction (\zeta+1) = \bar\alpha$ instead of $\bar\alpha$: the $(\bar\alpha, X, \zeta)$-standard trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ in $\mathbf{V}$ is:

(*a*) the set of elements is the set of functions f from a countable subset of α_ζ into $X \cup \bigcup\{\mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon}[X] : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$, abusing notation we assume that $\langle X\rangle\hat{}\langle \mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon}[X] : \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$ is an increasing sequence of structures and for $\varepsilon = 0$ we stipulate $\mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon-1}[X] = X$

(*b*) $f_1 \le_{\rm pr} f_2$ iff $\mathrm{Dom}(f_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f_2)$ and $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f_1) \Rightarrow \bigvee\limits_{\varepsilon \in [-1,\zeta)} \mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon}[X] \models f_1(\beta) \le_{\rm pr} f_2(\beta)$

(*c*) $f_1 \le f_2$ iff

  (*i*) $\mathrm{Dom}(f_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f_2)$

  (*ii*) $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f_1) \Rightarrow \bigvee\limits_{\varepsilon \in [-1,\zeta)} \mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon}[X] \models f_1(\beta) \le f_2(\beta)$

  (*iii*) the set $\{\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f_1) : \bigvee\limits_{\varepsilon \in [-1,\zeta]} \mathscr{F}_{\bar\alpha,\varepsilon}[X] \models f_1(\beta) \le f_2(\beta) \wedge \neg[f_1(\beta) \le_{\rm pr} f_2(\beta)]\}$ is finite

(*d*) $f_1 \le_{\rm apr} f_2$ iff

  (*i*) $f_1 \le f_2$

  (*ii*) $\mathrm{Dom}(f_1) = \mathrm{Dom}(f_2)$

  (*iii*) for all but finitely many $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f_1)$ we have $f_1(\beta) = f_2(\beta)$ and for the rest $\bigvee\limits_{\varepsilon \in [-1,\zeta)} f_1(\beta) \le_{\rm apr} f_2(\beta)$.

3) A trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is $\aleph_1$-complete if $(\mathscr{F}, \leq_{\rm pr})$ is $\aleph_1$-complete.

4) A trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is based on $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$ if:

- (a) each X_β is a trunk controller
- (b) $f \in \mathscr{F} \Rightarrow$ Dom$(f) \subseteq \alpha$ and $f \in \mathscr{F}$ & $\beta \in$ Dom$(f) \Rightarrow f(\beta) \in X_\beta$
- (c) if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathscr{F}$ has domain $\subseteq \alpha$, then $f_1 \leq_{\rm pr} f_2$ iff Dom$(f_1) \subseteq$ Dom(f_2) & $(\forall \beta \in$ Dom$(f_1))[X_\beta \models f_1(\beta) \leq_{\rm pr} f_2(\beta)]$
- (d) $f_1 \leq f_2$ iff
  - (i) Dom$(f_1) \subseteq$ Dom(f_2),
  - (ii) $\beta \in$ Dom$(f_1) \Rightarrow X_\beta \models f_1(\beta) \leq f_2(\beta)$ and
  - (iii) $\{\beta \in$ Dom$(f_1) : X_\beta \models f_1(\beta) \nleq_{\rm pr} f_2(\beta)\}$ is finite
- (e) if $f, g \in \mathscr{F}$, Dom$(f) \subseteq \beta < \alpha, g \restriction \beta \leq_x f$, then $f \cup (g \restriction [\beta, \alpha]) \in \mathscr{F}$ is $\leq_x$-lub of $\{f, g\}$ for $x \in \{us, pr\}$, see 1.5; also if $f_n \subseteq f_{n+1} \in \mathscr{F}$ for $n < \omega$ and $\bigcup\limits_n f_n \in \mathscr{F}$ then $\bigcup\limits_n f_n$ is a $\leq_{pr}$-lub of $\{f_n : n < \omega\}$ and is a $\leq$-upper bound of $\{f_n : n < \omega\}$
- (f) $f_1 \leq_{\rm apr} f_2$ iff
  - (i) Dom$(f_1) =$ Dom(f_2),
  - (ii) $\beta \in$ Dom$(f_1) \Rightarrow X_\beta \models f_1(\beta) \leq f_2(\beta)$
  - (iii) the set $\{\beta \in$ Dom$(f_1) : f_1(\beta) \neq f_2(\beta)\}$ is finite and for those β's, $X_\beta \models f_1(\beta) \leq_{\rm apr} f_2(\beta)$
- (g) if $f \in \mathscr{F}, \beta < \alpha$ then $f \restriction \beta \in \mathscr{F}$.

5) We say a trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is full over $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$ or fully based on it if:

- (α) $\mathscr{F}$ is based on $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$
- (β) whenever f is a function with domain a countable subset of α such that $\beta \in$ Dom$(f) \Rightarrow f(\beta) \in X_\beta$ then $f \in \mathscr{F}$.

6) We say a trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is finitely based over $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$ if:

- (α) $\mathscr{F}$ is based on $\langle X_\alpha : \beta < \alpha\rangle$
- (β) $0 \in X_\alpha$ minimal
- (γ) $f \in \mathscr{F}$ iff f is a function with domain a countable subset of α and $\{\beta \in$ Dom$(f) : \neg(0 \leq_{pr} f(\beta)\}$ is finite.

7) We say $\mathscr{F}$ is the trivial trunk controller if: its set of elements is $\mathscr{H}(\aleph_0)$ and $\le = \le_p = \le_{apr}$ are the equality on $\mathscr{H}(\aleph_0)$.
8) We say $\mathscr{F}$ is transparent if $p_0 \le_{pr} p_1$ & $p_0 \le_{pr} p_2 \Rightarrow (\exists p_3)(p_1 \le_{pr} p_3$ & $p_2 \le_{pr} p_3)$.
9) In part (4), (5), replacing $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ by α means "for some $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$".
10) In part (4), for $\beta < \alpha$ let $\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]} = \mathscr{F}[\beta]$ be X_β, (clearly normally uniquely defined).

1.2 Definition. 1) We say a trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is simple if: for any sequence $\langle y_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_2 \rangle$ with $y_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{F}$ for $\varepsilon < \omega_2$ for some club E of ω_2 and pressing down $h : E \to \omega_2$ we have: for any $\varepsilon < \zeta$ from E of cofinality $\aleph_1, h(\varepsilon) = h(\zeta) \Rightarrow y_\varepsilon, y_\zeta$ have a common $\le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathrm{pr}}$-upper bound.
2) We say the trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is semi simple if: for any $y_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{F}$ for $\varepsilon < \omega_2$ for some $\varepsilon < \zeta < \omega_2$, there is a common $\le_{\mathrm{pr}}$-upper bound of y_ε, y_ζ.
3) We say the trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is semi simply based on $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$ if it is based on it, X_0 is semi simple and every $X_{1+\beta}$ is simple. We say "simply based" if also X_0 is simple.
4) If $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller based on $\langle X_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha \rangle$ and $\beta \le \alpha$ then let $\mathscr{F} \restriction \beta = \{f \in \mathscr{F} : \mathrm{Dom}(f) \subseteq \beta\}$.

1.3 Claim. *Suppose that $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$ is a sequence of trunk controllers.*
1) There is a unique trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ fully based on $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$.
2) Assume CH. If $\mathscr{F}_0$ is a semi simple trunk controller and each $\mathscr{F}_{1+\beta}$ is a simple trunk controller and $\mathscr{F}$ is semi simply based on $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ then the $\mathscr{F}$ from part (1) is semi simple.
3) In part (2) if also $\mathscr{F}_0$ is simple, then $\mathscr{F}$ is simple.
4) For every trunk controller X and ζ and $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \le \zeta \rangle, \mathscr{F}_{\bar{\alpha},\zeta}[X]$, is a well defined trunk controller, simple if X is simple.
5) If each $\mathscr{F}_\beta$ is $\aleph_1$-complete, then in part (1) also $\mathscr{F}$ is $\aleph_1$-complete. Similarly in part (4), if X is $\aleph_1$-complete, then $\mathscr{F}_{\alpha,\zeta}[X]$ is $\aleph_1$-complete.

1.4 Claim. *1) If $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller based on $\langle X_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha \rangle$ and $\beta \le \alpha$ then $\mathscr{F} \restriction \beta$ is a trunk controller based on $\langle X_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle$.*
Similarly for "fully based".
2) If $\mathscr{F}$ is simple, then $\mathscr{F}$ is semi-simple.

1.5 Convention. : Let $\le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathrm{us}} = \le^{\mathscr{F}}$ and we write $\le^{\mathscr{F}}_x$ for x varying on {us,pr,apr}. Similarly in Definition 1.6.

1.6 Definition. A $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ means: a tuple $(Q, \le, \le_{\rm pr}, \le_{\rm apr}, {\rm val})$ (we may put superscript $\mathbb{Q}$ to clarify) satisfying:

- (a) Q is a nonempty set (- the set of conditions) (we may write $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ instead of $p \in Q$ and say $\mathbb{Q}$-names, etc. and Q instead $(Q, \le)$)
- (b) $\le, \le_{\rm pr}, \le_{\rm apr}$ are quasi-orders on $\mathbb{Q}$ (called the usual, the pure and the apure)
- (c) $\le_{\rm pr} \subseteq \le$ and $\le_{\rm apr} \subseteq \le$
- (d) val is a function from Q to $\mathscr{F}$, a trunk controller
- (e) $\mathbb{Q} \models p \le_x q \Rightarrow \mathscr{F} \models \ {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p) \le_x \ {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q)$ for $x =$ us,pr,apr
- (f) if $p_0 \le p_2$ then for some p_1 we have $p_0 \le_{\rm pr} p_1 \le_{\rm apr} p_2$ and we can (i.e. $\mathscr{F}$ give the additional information how to) compute ${\rm val}(p_1)$ from $({\rm val}(p_0), {\rm val}(p_2))$; we write ${\rm val}(p_1) = \ {\rm inter}_{\mathscr{F}}({\rm val}(p_0), {\rm val}(p_2))$; so we are abusing our notation as we should have expanded $\mathscr{F}$ by the function inter.

1.7 Definition. 1) $\mathbb{Q}$, an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing is very clear (as an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing) or a very clear $\mathscr{F}$-forcing if:

- $(*)$ if $p_0, p_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_0)$,${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_0)$ has a common $\le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\rm pr}$-upper bound y then for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ we have $p_0 \le_{\rm pr} q, p_1 \le_{\rm pr} q$ and ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = y$.

2) $\mathbb{Q}$ is basic when: if $p_0 \le p_2$ then for some p_1 we have $p_0 \le_{pr} p_1 \le_{apr} p_2$ and ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1) = \ {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_0)$.
3) Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing, it is straight, or $\mathscr{F}$-straight when:
if $p_1 \le_{apr} q_1, p_1 \le_{pr} p_2$ and p_2, q_1 are compatible, then there is q_2 such that $q_1 \le q_2, p_2 \le_{apr} q_2$ which is a $\le^{\mathbb{Q}}$-lub of p_2, q_1 and ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_2)$ can be computed from $\langle {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1), {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_2), {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_1)\rangle$, and we stipulate that this computation is a function which is part of the trunk controller. We call it ${\rm amal}_{\mathscr{F}}(-,-)$ (the point is that when we iterate over $\mathbf{V}$ this function will be $\mathbf{V}$). If p_2, q_1 are incompatible, we use $q_2 = q_1$. [Used in 2.5, 2.7].
4) An $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is called clear or $\mathscr{F}$-clear when: if $p \le_{pr} p_1, p \le_{pr} p_2$ and p_1, p_2 are $\le_{pr}$-compatible then they have a common $\le_{pr}$-upper bound q with ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q)$ computable (see (3)) from $\langle {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p), {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1), {\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_2)\rangle$ and we denote it by ${\rm pramal}(-,-,-)$. [Used in 2.5, 2.7; this is not part (1)].
5) An $\mathscr{F}$ forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is weakly[1] clear when:

- (1) If $p_0, p_1 \in Q$ and ${\rm val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_0)$, ${\rm val}(p_1)$ are $\le_{\rm pr}$-compatible in $\mathscr{F}$, then p_0, p_1 are $\le_{pr}$-compatible.

---

[1] this seems not to imply clear

6) We say $\mathbb{Q}$ is transparent[2] (or $\mathscr{F}$-transparent) when: if $p_0 \le_{pr} p_1, p_0 \le_{pr} p_2, \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1) \le_{pr} y_3, \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_2) \le_{pr} y_3 \in \mathscr{F}$, then there is $p_3 \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $p_1 \le_{pr} p_3, p_2 \le_{pr} p_3$ and $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_3) = y_3$.

1.8 Discussion: 1) We may involve measures; this, of course, also complicates the iteration. Interest not clear at present.
2) We can consider some variants: if $p \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, do we just ask q_1, q_2 compatible? Does it suffice to demand "val(q_1), val(q_2) are $\le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathrm{pr}}$-compatible"? The example satisfies this but the general theorems do not need it.

1.9 Definition. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a trunk controller based on $\langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$. We define by induction on the ordinal $\alpha \le \alpha^*$ what is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ of length α and what is $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$

- (a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length α if
  - (α) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$
  - (β) if $\beta < \alpha$ then $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length β
  - (γ) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $\mathbb{P}_\beta = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta)$
  - (δ) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name of an X_β-forcing notion
- (b) for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length α we define the $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion $\mathbb{P}_\alpha = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ as follows (see 1.11):
  - (α) the set of elements of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is the set of p such that for some $f \in \mathscr{F}$ we have
    - (i) p a function
    - (ii) $\mathrm{Dom}(p) = \mathrm{Dom}(f)$, so is a countable subset of α
    - (iii) for $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$ we have $p(\beta)$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name of a member of $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$
    - (iv) $\Vdash_{P_\beta}$ "$\mathrm{val}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(p(\beta)) = f(\beta)$" for $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$
    - (v)[3] $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow p \restriction \beta \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$.

    Clearly f is unique and we call it f^p or $f[p]$

---

[2] This simplifies quite a number of definitions below. Of course, instead for every y_3 it is enough to have one such $y_3 = y_3(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1) : \ell < 3)$, this function being part of $\mathscr{F}$

[3] actually follows

(β) $\leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}_{\rm pr}$ is defined by:
$p \leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}_{\rm pr} q$ iff ($p, q \in P_\alpha$ and) $\mathrm{Dom}(p) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(q)$ and

$$\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \Rightarrow q \restriction \beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta} \text{“}p(\beta) \overset{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}{\leq_{\rm pr}} q(\beta)\text{”}$$

(γ) $\leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ is defined by:
$p \leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} q$ iff ($p, q \in P_\alpha$ and)

(i) $\mathrm{Dom}(p) \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(q)$ and

(ii) $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \Rightarrow q \restriction \beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ “$p(\beta) \overset{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}{\leq} q(\beta)$” and

(iii) for some finite $w \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(\beta)$ we have $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \backslash w \Rightarrow q \restriction \beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ “$p(\beta) \overset{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}{\leq_{\rm pr}} q(\beta)$”

(δ) $\leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}_{\rm apr}$ is defined by
$p \leq^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}_{\rm apr} q$ iff ($p, q \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ and)

(i) $\mathrm{Dom}(p) = \mathrm{Dom}(q)$ and

(ii) $p \leq q$ and

(iii) $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \Rightarrow q \restriction \beta \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ “$p(\beta) \leq_{\rm apr} q(\beta)$ in $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$”

(iv) for all but finitely[4] many $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$ we have $p(\beta) = q(\beta)$.

1.10 Convention: If $\mathscr{F}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ are as in 1.9 then $\mathbb{P}_\alpha = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$.

1.11 Claim. *If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration and $\beta \leq \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, then $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ is a $(\mathscr{F} \restriction \beta)$-forcing.*

Proof. Straight, the least obvious is checking clause (f) of Definition 1.6.

Clause (f): Assume $p_0 \leq p_2$ and we shall define p_1. Let $\mathrm{Dom}(p_1) = \mathrm{Dom}(p_2)$ and let the finite $w \subseteq \mathrm{Dom}(f_1)$ be as in $(\gamma)(iii)$ of 1.9(b), and we choose $p_1(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(p_1)$ a follows. If $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(p_2) \backslash \mathrm{Dom}(p_0)$ we let $p_1(\alpha) = p_2(\alpha)$, and if $\alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(p_0)$ and $\alpha \notin w$ we let $p_1(\alpha) = p_2(\alpha)$. If $\alpha \in w$ by Definition 1.6(f), we know that $p_2 \restriction \alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ “$p_0(\alpha) \leq p_2(\alpha)$” hence $(\exists p)[p_0(\alpha)) \leq^{\mathbb{Q}_\alpha}_{pr} p \overset{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha}{\leq_{apr}} p_2(\alpha)$ & $\mathrm{val}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(p) = \mathrm{interp}_{\mathscr{F}[\alpha]}(\mathrm{val}_{\mathscr{F}[\alpha]}(p_0(\alpha)), \mathrm{val}^{\mathscr{F}[\alpha]}(p_2(\alpha)))]$ and choose $p(\alpha)$ as such p. Now check.

---

[4] actually follows by clause (ii), when (as usual) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ “if $p' \leq^{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}_{pr} q'$ and $p' \leq^{\mathbb{Q}_\beta}_{apr} q'$ then $p' = q'$”

1.12 Claim. *Assume $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller based on $\bar{X} = \langle X_\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$; moreover is fully based on $\bar{X}$ (see Definition 1.1(5)) and $\alpha \le \alpha^*$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length α and $\gamma \le \beta \le \alpha$.*

1) If $p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$ then $p \restriction \gamma \in \mathbb{P}_\gamma$ and $\mathbb{P}_\beta \models$ "$p \restriction \gamma \le_{\mathrm{pr}} p$".

2) $\mathbb{P}_\gamma \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\beta$, i.e. $p \in \mathbb{P}_\gamma \Rightarrow p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$ and $\le^{\mathbb{P}_\gamma}_x = \le^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}_x \restriction \mathbb{P}_\gamma$ (see convention 1.5).

3) If $p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta, x \in \{us,pr,apr\}, p \restriction \gamma \le^{\mathbb{P}_\gamma}_x q \in \mathbb{P}_\gamma$ and $r = q \cup (p \restriction (\gamma, \beta))$, then r is $\le^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}_x$-lub of $\{p, q\}$ when $x \in \{us, pr\}$ and $p \le_{apr} r$ & $q \le_{pr} r$ when $x = apr$.

4) $\mathbb{P}_\gamma \lessdot \mathbb{P}_\beta$.

Proof. Straight, by induction on α.

1.13 Claim. *Assume $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length α and $\mathbb{P} = Lim(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$.*

1) The property "very clear", 1.7(1) is preserved, i.e. if each $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ $(\beta < \alpha)$ is very clear, then so is $\mathbb{P}$.

2) The property "straight", 1.7(3) is preserved.

3) The property "clear", 1.7(4) is preserved.

Proof. Straight.

1.14 Claim. *1) For an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$; very clear implies clear and implies weakly clear.*

2) Assume $\mathbb{Q}$ is a $\mathscr{F}$-forcing, $\mathbb{Q}$ is weakly clear (1.7(5)), and $\mathscr{F}$ is semi-simple, then $\mathbb{Q}$ and even $(\mathbb{Q}, \le_{pr})$ satisfies the $\aleph_2$-c.c.

3) Assume $\mathbb{Q}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing, $\mathbb{Q}$ is weakly clear and $\mathscr{F}$ is simple, then $\mathbb{Q}$ and even $(\mathbb{Q}, \le_{pr})$ satisfies the regressive $\aleph_2$-c.c.

Proof. Straight.

1.15 Claim. *Assume $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller based on α^*.*

0) The empty sequence is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration.

1) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration of length $\alpha, \alpha + 1 \le \alpha^*$ and $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name of an X_α-forcing notion, then there is a $\mathscr{F}$-iteration $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'$ of length $\alpha + 1$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \restriction \alpha = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}'_\alpha = \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}$ that is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}\hat{\ }\langle Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}), \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}} \rangle$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration.

2) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ and α is a limit ordinal and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration for every $\beta < \alpha$ then $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration.

3) For any function $\mathbf{F}$ *and ordinal* $\alpha \le \alpha^*$ *there is a unique* $\mathscr{F}$*-iteration* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ *such that:*

- (α) $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \le \alpha$
- (β) $\beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \Rightarrow \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta = \mathbf{F}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta)$
- (γ) *if* $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) < \alpha$ *then* $\mathbf{F}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ *is not a* $(Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}))$*-name of an* $\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}_\beta$*-forcing.*

Proof. Straight.

Not really necessary, but natural and aesthetic, is

1.16 Claim. *Associativity holds, that is assume*

- (a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$ *is an* $\mathscr{F}$*-iteration so* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*} = \ Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$
- (b) $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \le \varepsilon^* \rangle$ *is increasing continuous,* $\alpha_0 = 0, \alpha_{\varepsilon^*} = \alpha^*$
- (c) *for* $\gamma \le \beta \le \alpha^*$ *we define* $\mathbb{P}_\beta/\mathbb{P}_\gamma$*, an* $\mathscr{F}$*-forcing, naturally: it is a* $\mathbb{P}_\gamma$*-name so for* $G_\gamma \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\gamma$ *generic over* $\mathbf{V}$ *its interpretation is:*

  set of elements is $\{p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta : Dom(p) \subseteq [\gamma, \beta)\}$
  val: inherited from $\mathbb{P}_\beta$
  $\le_x$: $p \le_x q$ *iff for some* $r \in G_\gamma$ *we have* $\mathbb{P}_\beta \models r \cup p \le_x r \cup q$
- (d) *let* $\mathscr{F}' = \{f : \text{for some } g \in \mathscr{F}, f \text{ is a function with domain } \{\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* : Dom(g) \cap [\alpha_\varepsilon, \alpha_{\varepsilon+1}) \ne \emptyset\} \text{ and } \varepsilon \in \ Dom(f) \Rightarrow f(\varepsilon) = g \restriction [\alpha_\varepsilon, \alpha_{\varepsilon+1})\}$*, the orders of* $\mathscr{F}'$ *are natural.*

Then we can find an $\mathscr{F}'$*-iteration* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' = \langle \mathbb{P}'_\varepsilon, \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \rangle$ *and* $\langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \le \varepsilon^* \rangle$ *such that*

- (α) F_ε *is an isomorphism from* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ *onto* $\mathbb{P}'_\varepsilon$
- (β) *when* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*, F_\varepsilon$ *maps the* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$*-name* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}/\mathbb{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ *to the* $\mathbb{P}'_\varepsilon$*-name* $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}'_\varepsilon$.

Remark. For standard $\mathscr{F}$ we can use $\mathscr{F}' = \mathscr{F}$.

Proof. Straight.

1.17 Discussion: May we be interested in nonstarndard $\mathscr{F}$? Maybe, if CH holds, $\eta_\alpha \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ for $\alpha < \alpha^*$ are pairwise distinct, and we are interested in $\mathscr{F}$ such that $\{f(\alpha) : f \in \mathscr{F}\}$ depend on η_α continuously. So for proving $\aleph_2$-c.c. we have a stronger handle.

1.18 Definition. 1) $\mathbb{Q}$ has (θ, σ)-pure decidability if:

if $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \theta$", then for some $A \subseteq \theta, |A| < \sigma$ and q we have $p \le_{\text{pr}} q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} = A$".

2) We write "θ-pure decidability" for "(θ, θ)-pure decidability".

§2

Being $\mathscr{F}$-Pseudo c.c.c. is preserved by $\mathscr{F}$-iterations

The reader may concentrate on the transparent case, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9(3) (but read the proofs of 2.9(1),(2)) and 2.12 and continue using the Knaster explicit version.
In the main cases, $\mathbf{H}$ disappears but $\Game_p$ is needed for the iteration.

2.1 Definition. 1) Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a trunk controller, $\mathbb{Q}$ be an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion. We say that $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc ($\mathscr{F}$-pseudo c.c.c. forcing in full) as witnessed by $\mathbf{H}$ if:

for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ in the following game $\Game_p = \Game_{p,\mathbb{Q},\mathbf{H}} = \Game_p[\mathbb{Q},\mathbf{H}]$ between the player interpolator and extendor which lasts ω_1 moves, the interpolator has a winning strategy.

In the ζ-th move:

- ⊠ the interpolator chooses a condition p'_ζ such that $p \le_{\rm pr} p'_\zeta$ and $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p'_\zeta) = \mathbf{H}(\langle \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\xi),\ \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\xi)) : \xi < \zeta\rangle)$ and then the extendor chooses $q_\zeta \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $p'_\zeta \le q_\zeta$ and lastly the interpolator chooses a condition p_ζ such that $p'_\zeta \le_{\rm pr} p_\zeta \le_{\rm apr} q_\zeta$ and $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\zeta) = \mathbf{H}(\langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\xi),\ \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\xi)) : \xi < \zeta\rangle{}^\frown\langle \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\zeta)\rangle)$.
  [For future notation let p^*_ζ be p'_ζ and let $q_{-1} = p$].

A play is won by the interpolator if:

- (α) for any stationary $A \subseteq \omega_1$, for some $B \subseteq A$ we have
  - $(*)$ B is stationary and $\mathbf{H}(\langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\xi),\ \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\xi)) : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle{}^\frown\langle B\rangle) = 1$
- (β) if $B \subseteq \omega_1$ satisfy $(*)$ then: for every $\varepsilon < \zeta$ from B we have: q_ε, q_ζ are compatible in $\mathbb{Q}$ if $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\varepsilon)$, $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\zeta)$ are compatible in $\mathscr{F}$
- (γ) for $E = \omega_1$ or just E a club of ω_1 computed from $\langle \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\varepsilon), \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\varepsilon)) : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ we have: if $\varepsilon < \zeta$ are from E, $p_\varepsilon \le_{\rm pr} q_\varepsilon$ and $p_\zeta \le_{\rm pr} q_\zeta$, then q_ε, q_ζ has a common $\le_{\rm pr}$-upper bound q, with $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = \mathbf{H}(\varepsilon, \zeta, \langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\xi), \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\varepsilon) : \xi \le \zeta\rangle)$.
  [Why not just $\varepsilon < \zeta$ from B? For the iteration theorem 2.12.]

2) We define "$\mathbb{Q}$ is $(\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{P})$-psc" as above but at the end defining when a play is won by the interpolator, we make the changes:

- $(\alpha)'$ in every limit stage he has a legal move or the sequence $\langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\xi), \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\xi)) : \xi < \zeta\rangle$ is not in $\mathscr{P}$
- $(\beta)'$ if $\langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\zeta), \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\zeta)) : \zeta < \omega_1\rangle \in \mathscr{P}$ then for every stationary set $A \in \mathscr{P}$ of ω_1, there is a stationary subset $B \in \mathscr{P}$ as there.

3) We can replace $\langle(\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p_\varepsilon),\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\varepsilon)) : \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$ by $\langle \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q_\varepsilon) : -1 \le \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$.
4) If we omit $\mathbf{H}$ and say bare, this means that: we just omit the relevant demands on the interpolator in $\boxtimes$ and in $(*)$ of (α) of part (1), just requires that (β) and (γ) holds: if we omit clause (γ) of (1) we say "weakly" $\mathscr{F}$-psc.
5) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-straight if each $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is $\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}$-straight; similarly $\mathscr{F}$-clear.

6) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is semi-straight (or semi $\mathscr{F}$-straight) if each $\mathbb{Q}_{1+\beta}$ is $\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}$-straight similarly semi $\mathscr{F}$-clear.

Remark. Note that 3.1(1) speak actually on any semi straight $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing $\mathbb{P}$.

2.2 Definition. 1) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration as witnessed by $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$ if:

- (a) $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller, fully based on some $\alpha' \ge \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$
- (b) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration and
- (c) for every $\beta < \ell g(\bar{Q})$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is an $(\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}, \mathbf{V})$-psc as witnessed by $\mathbf{H}_\beta$" and $\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \langle \mathbf{H}_\beta : \beta < \ell g(\bar{Q})\rangle$;
  note that $\mathbf{H}_\beta \in \mathbf{V}$ and is an object, not a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name
- (d) let us stress that the witnesses for "$\mathbb{Q}_{1+\beta}$ is straight/clear" are given in $\mathbf{V}$ (not as name).

2) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an essentially $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration as witnessed by $\mathbf{H}$ if

- (a) it is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration
- (b) $\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \langle \bar{\mathbf{H}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha^*\rangle$ or $\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \langle \mathbf{H}_\beta : 0 < \beta < \alpha^*\rangle$ and $\alpha^* \ge \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$
- (c) for every nonzero $\beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ we have

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta} \text{“}\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta \text{ is an } (\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}, \mathbf{V})\text{-psc forcing notion as witnessed by } \mathbf{H}_\beta\text{”}$$

- (d) $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ satisfies the c.c.c. and $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_0}_{\mathrm{pr}}, \le^{\mathbb{Q}_0}_{\mathrm{apr}}$ are equality and $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}_0}$ is constantly 0.

3) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a semi simple $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration if:

- (a) it is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration
- (b) for every non zero $\beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is a simple $(\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}, \mathbf{V})$-psc forcing notion".

2.3 Remark. No harm demanding

- (c) $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ satisfies the c.c.c. and $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_0}_{\mathrm{pr}}$ is equality, $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_0}_{\mathrm{apr}}$ is $\le^{\mathbb{Q}_0}$ and $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}_0}$ is constantly 0.

2.4 Definition. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be at trunk controller and $\mathbb{Q}$ an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing.
1) We say that $\mathbb{Q}$ is strongly $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing notion as witnessed by $\mathbf{H}$ if for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ in the game $\Game'_p = \Game'_{p,\mathbb{Q},\mathbf{H}} = \Game'_p[\mathbb{Q},\mathbf{H}]$ the interpolator has a winning strategy, where the game is defined as in 2.1 except that in addition we demand

$$\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \models p'_\varepsilon \leq_{pr} p'_\zeta.$$

2) Adding the adjective "semi" (in 2.1(1) hence in (1) here) means just that in clause (β) we just ask for some $\varepsilon < \zeta$ in B, the conditions q_ε, q_ζ are compatible in $\mathbb{Q}$; so we call the games semi-$\Game_p$, semi-$\Game'_p$. In Definition 2.2 and 2.4(2) adding "semi" means, $\mathbb{Q}_0$ satisfies the semi version, each $\mathbb{Q}_{1+\alpha}$ the regular one.
3) Saying "strongly" in Definition 2.2 means that the demands are for each $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$.

2.5 Claim. *1) If in Definition 2.1, $\mathbb{Q}$ is bare $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing and is $\mathscr{F}$-clear or at least straight (see Definition 1.7) then $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc (as witnessed by some $\mathbf{H}$, so $\mathbf{H}$ is redundant), similarly with $\mathscr{P}$.*
2) Assume

- (a) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is a σ-centered forcing notion, i.e. $\mathbb{Q} = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} R_n$ each R_n directed and for simplicity may assume $n \neq m \Rightarrow R_m \cap R_m = \emptyset$*
- (b) *$\mathscr{F}$ is standard*
- (c) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is defined by: $(Q^{\mathbb{Q}}, \leq^{\mathbb{Q}})$ is Q,*
  $\leq^{\mathbb{Q}}_{\mathrm{pr}}$ *is equality*
  $\leq^{\mathbb{Q}}_{\mathrm{apr}}$ *is* $\leq^{\mathbb{Q}}$
  $val^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = \ Min\{n : q \in R_n\}$.

Then $\mathbb{Q}$ is a $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing as witnessed by a trivial $\mathbf{H}$, and is purely proper.
3) Assume

- (a) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is a forcing notion, α^* is an ordinal, $\bar{h} = \langle h_q : q \in \mathbb{Q}\rangle$ is such that each h_q is a finite (partial) function from α^* to ω and: if $h = h_{q_1} \cup h_{q_2}$ is a function then q_1, q_2 has a common upper bound q with $h_q = h_{q_1} \cup h_{q_2}$*
- (b) *$\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller whose set of elements include $\{h_q : q \in Q\}$ such that $h_{q_1} \subseteq h_{q_2} \Rightarrow \mathscr{F} \models h_{q_1} \leq h_{q_2}$*
- (c) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is defined as in clause (c) above except that $val^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = h_q$.*

Then $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc.

Proof. Straightforward. In part (1), the "$\mathbb{Q}$ is a clear $\mathscr{F}$-forcing" is used for clause (γ) in 2.1(1); for using "straight" note that in clause (γ) also $p_\varepsilon \leq_{pr} q_\varepsilon$ hold by the demands in 2.1(γ), as well as $p_\varepsilon \leq_{apr} q_\varepsilon$ by ⊠ of 2.1(1). $\square_{2.5}$

2.6 Definition. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a trunk controller.
1) $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies the psc if:

$(*)$ if $\mathscr{F} \models$ "$x \le_{pr} y_\varepsilon \le_{apr} z_\varepsilon$" for $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ and $A \subseteq \omega_1$ is stationary then for some stationary $B \subseteq A$ we have:
if $\varepsilon < \zeta$ are from B then z_ε, z_ζ has a common upper bound z such that:
- (α) $\text{val}(z) = \text{glue}_{\mathscr{F},\varepsilon,\zeta}(z_\varepsilon, z_\zeta, y_\varepsilon, y_\zeta)$
- (β) if $y_\varepsilon \le_{pr} z_\varepsilon, y_\zeta \le_{pr} z_\zeta$ then $z_\zeta \le_{pr} z$.

2) $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies the semi-psc if:

$(*)$ if $\mathscr{F} \models$ "$x \le_{pr} y_\varepsilon \le_{apr} z_\varepsilon$" for $\varepsilon < \omega_1$, then for some $\varepsilon < \zeta < \omega_1, z_\varepsilon, z_\zeta$ has a common upper bound z such that $(\alpha) + (\beta)$ above holds.

3) In parts (1), (2) we add the adjective "continuous" if in $(*)$ we add $\varepsilon < \zeta < \omega_1 \Rightarrow \mathscr{F} \models$ "$y_\varepsilon \le_{pr} y_\zeta$". We add Knaster if we replace stationary by unbounded (this is alternative to semi[7], but not for iteration!)
4) We add the adjective "finished" if we omit clause (γ) in 2.1(1) and its variants.
5) We say that an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is [Knaster] explicitly [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing if

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-forcing
- (b) $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies the [Knaster][semi] psc
- (c) if $z = \text{glue}_{\mathscr{F},\varepsilon,\zeta}(z', z'', y', y'')$ and $q', q'', p', p'' \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p' \le_{pr} p'', p' \le_{apr} q', p'' \le_{apr} q'', y' = \text{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p'), y'' = \text{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p''), z' = \text{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q'), z'' = \text{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q'')$, then there is $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that:
  - (α) $\text{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = \text{glue}_{\mathscr{F}}(z, z', z'', y', y'')$
  - (β) if $p' \le_{pr} q', p'' \le_{pr} q''$ then $q'' \le_{pr} q$.

6) We say $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a Knaster explicit [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc

- (a) $\mathscr{F}$ is a trunk controller, fully based on some $\alpha' \ge \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$
- (b) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration
- (c) $\mathscr{F}^{[0]}$ satisfies the Knaster [semi] psc; $\aleph_1$-complete
- (d) $\mathscr{F}^{[1+\beta]}$ satisfies the [Knaster] psc when $1 + \beta < \ell g(\bar{Q})$; $\aleph_1$-complete
- (e) $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is explicitly [Knaster][semi] $\mathscr{F}^{[0]}$-psc,$\le_{pr} -\aleph_1$-complete
- (f) $\mathbb{Q}_{1+\beta}$ is (forced to be) an explicitly [Knaster] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing $\le_{pr} -\aleph_1$-complete.

7) We (in (5), (6)) add continuous if so are the $\mathscr{F}$'s.

2.7 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) *$\mathscr{F}$ is a [semi]-psc trunk controller*
- (b) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion.*

Then $\mathbb{Q}$ is a [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing notion.
2) Assume

- (a) *$\mathscr{F}$ is a continuous [semi]-psc trunk controller*
- (b) *$\mathbb{Q}$ is a straight $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion*
- (c) *$(\mathbb{Q}, \le_{pr})$ is $\aleph_1$-complete.*

Then $\mathbb{Q}$ is a [semi] strong $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing notion.

2.8 Claim. *Assume $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an explicitly [Knaster/semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration.*
1) If $\beta \le \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, then $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta$ is an explicitly [Knaster/semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration.
2) If the trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is fully based on $\langle \mathscr{F}^\beta : \beta < \alpha^* \rangle$ each $F^{[1+\beta]}$ satisfies [Knaster]-psc and $\mathscr{F}^{[0]}$ satisfies [Knaster/semi]-psc, then $\mathscr{F}$ satisfies [Knaster/semi]-psc.
3) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is explicitly [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing, then $\mathbb{Q}$ is strongly [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing.

Proof. Should be clear.

2.9 Claim. *1) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc and $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\tau}_m$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name of an ordinal for $m < \omega$, then for some q and $\langle \alpha_n : n < \omega \rangle$ we have:*

- (a) *$p \le_{\rm pr} q$*
- (b) *$q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_m \in \{\alpha_n : n < \omega\}$ for $m < \omega$".*

2) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is strong $\mathscr{F}$-psc, then $\mathbb{Q}$ is purely proper.
3) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is explicitly [Knaster/semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc, then $\mathbb{Q}$ is purely proper.

2.10 Remark. 1) If $\mathbb{Q}$ is straight (see 1.7(3)) we can add in 2.9(1):

- (c) $\mathscr{I}_q = \{r : q \le_{\rm apr} r$ and r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}\}$ is predense over p; see §3.

2) Note that if every stationary $\mathscr{S} \subseteq [2^{|\mathbb{Q}|}]^{\aleph_0}$ reflects in some $A \subseteq 2^{|\mathbb{Q}|}$ of cardinality $\aleph_1$ then also in 2.9(1) we can get purely properness. So the difference is very small and still strange.

Proof. 1) Assume not and let $\mathbf{H}$ be a witness for "$\mathbb{Q}$ is psc". So simulate a play of the game $\Game_p = \Game_{p,\mathbb{Q},\mathbf{H}}$, where the interpolator plays using a fixed winning strategy whereas the extendor chooses q_ζ such that:

(α) $p'_\zeta \le q_\zeta$ (see notation in 2.1(1))
(i.e. a legal move)

(β) for some $m_\zeta < \omega$ the condition q_ζ forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}_{m_\zeta}$, call it j_ζ

(γ) $j_\zeta \notin \{j_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$.

If the extendor can choose q_ζ for every $\zeta < \omega_1$, in the end $\varepsilon < \zeta \ \& \ m_\varepsilon = m_\zeta \Rightarrow q_\varepsilon, q_\zeta$ are incompatible (as $j_\varepsilon \ne j_\zeta$) but the interpolator has to win the play (as he has used his winning strategy); contradiction by $(\beta) + (\gamma)$ of 2.1(1).

So necessarily for some $\zeta < \omega_1$ there is no q as required. Let p^* be p'_ζ so $p \le_{\rm pr} p^*$ by the definition of the game. By our assumption toward contradiction, for some m we have $p^* \nVdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_m \in \{j_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$" hence for some q we have $p^* \le q$ and $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_m \notin \{j_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$" so without loss of generality for some j we have $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_m = j$". But then the extendor could have chosen $q_\zeta = q, j_\zeta = j$ and so clauses $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ holds, a contradiction.

Note that we could have replaced clause (γ) by

$(\gamma)^-$ q_ζ is incompatible with q_ε whenever $\varepsilon < \zeta$ and $m_\xi = m_\varepsilon$.

2) Let $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$ be countable, $\mathbb{Q} \in N$ and $p \in N \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Let $\langle \underset{\sim}{\tau}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ list the $\mathbb{Q}$-names of ordinals which belongs to N. We define a strategy $\mathbf{St}_e$ for the extendor in the game $\Game_p$; so in stage ζ he has to choose q_ζ such that $p'_\zeta \le q_\zeta$. If for some n, for no countable set X of ordinals, $p^*_\zeta \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \in X$" let $n(\zeta)$ be the minimal such n, and as by the proof of the first part there are (q, j) such that: $p'_\zeta \le q$ and $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_{n(\zeta)} = j$" and $j \notin \{i :$ for some $\varepsilon < \zeta$ we have $q_\varepsilon \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_{n(\zeta)} = i$"$\}$, choose a $<^*_\chi$-minimal such pair, call it (q_ζ, j_ζ), so the extendor will choose q_ζ. If there is no such n, let $n(\zeta) = \omega$ and $q_\zeta = p'_\zeta$. Now in $\Game_p$ the interpolator has a winning strategy $\mathbf{St}_i$, without loss of generality $\mathbf{St}_i \in N$. Let $\langle p_\zeta, q_\zeta : \zeta < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a play where the interpolator uses the strategy $\mathbf{St}_i$ and the extendor uses the strategy $\mathbf{St}_e$, clearly it exists and the interpolator wins. Clearly $\varepsilon < \zeta < \omega_1 \Rightarrow n(\varepsilon) \le n(\zeta)$ (read the choices above). Now we can prove by induction on n that for some $\zeta < \omega_1, n(\zeta) > n$ and let ζ_n be the minimal such n, so $p_{\zeta_n} \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \in X_n$" for some countable X_n set of ordinals. If we fail for n, then $\bigcup\limits_{m<n} \zeta_m < \zeta < \varepsilon < \omega_1 \Rightarrow (q_\zeta \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\tau} = j_\zeta) \ \& \ (q_\xi \Vdash \underset{\sim}{\tau} = j_\varepsilon) \Rightarrow (q_\zeta, q_\varepsilon$ incompatible), (see choice of j_ε), but this contradicts the use of

$\mathbf{St}_i$. Now $\langle p_\zeta, q_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta_n \rangle$ can be defined from p, $\mathbf{St}_i$, $\langle \underset{\sim}{\tau}_\ell : \ell \le n \rangle$ and $\mathbf{H}$ (read the definition of $\mathbf{St}_e$) hence $\langle p_\zeta, q_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta_n \rangle \in N$, so $\zeta_n \in N$, and similarly $p_{\zeta_n} \in N$. So as $p_{\zeta_n} \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \in X_n$", the set $\{\xi : p_{\zeta_n} \nVdash \text{"}\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \ne \xi\text{"}\}$ is countable and it belongs to N. So $p_{\zeta_n} \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau}_n \in N \cap$ Ord". Now if $\zeta < \omega_1$ is $\ge \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \zeta_n$ then p_ζ is as required.

3) Same proofs, only easier (in some cases follows by 2.8(3)). $\square_{2.9}$.

2.11 Remark. Of course, if $(Q^{\mathbb{Q}}, \le^{\mathbb{Q}}_{pr})$ is $\aleph_1$-complete, part (2) of 2.9 follows from part (1) easily.

2.12 Lemma. *Assume that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a [strong], [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc-iteration. Then for every $\beta \le \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ we have $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ is a [strong], [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing notion.*

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \langle \mathbf{H}_\beta : \beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ be a witness for "$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a [strong], [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration". Let $\beta \le \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$, and define $\mathbf{H}^\beta$ naturally composing the $\langle \mathbf{H}_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle$ and we shall describe a winning strategy for the interpolator in the game $\Game'_p = \Game'_{p,\mathbb{P}_\beta,\mathbf{H}^\beta}$; he just guarantees that:

- (a) $\mathrm{Dom}(p_\zeta) = \mathrm{Dom}(q_\zeta)$
- (b) if $p_\zeta(\gamma) \ne q_\zeta(\gamma)$ then $\gamma \in \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} \mathrm{Dom}(p_\varepsilon)$
- (c) if $\gamma \in \bigcup\limits_{\zeta<\omega_1} \mathrm{Dom}(p_\zeta)$ and $\xi(\gamma) = \mathrm{Min}\{\zeta : \zeta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p_\zeta)\}$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\gamma}$ "$\langle p_{\xi(\gamma)+1+\zeta}(\gamma), q_{\xi(\gamma)+1+\zeta}(\gamma) : \zeta < \omega_1 \rangle$ is a play of $\Game'_{p_{\xi(\gamma)}(\gamma)}, [\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\gamma, \mathbf{H}^\gamma]$ or the semi version in which the interpolator uses a fixed winning strategy $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{S}t}{}^\gamma_{p_{\xi(\gamma)}}$"
- (d) $\mathrm{Dom}(p'_\zeta) = \cup\{\mathrm{Dom}(p_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$.

Let $\langle p'_\zeta, p_\zeta, q_\zeta : \zeta < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a play of the game $\Game_p[\mathbb{P}_\beta]$ in which the interpolator uses the strategy described above. To prove that the interpolator wins the play, let $A \subseteq \omega_1$ be stationary and $A \in \mathbf{V}$, of course. For $\zeta \in \bigcup\limits_{\zeta<\omega_1} \mathrm{Dom}(p_\zeta)$ let E_ζ be as in clause (γ) of 2.1(1) (or the relevant variant) and $E = \{\delta : \delta \text{ limit and } \zeta \in \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\delta} \mathrm{Dom}(p_\varepsilon) \Rightarrow \delta \in E_\zeta\}$. Define $w_\zeta = \{\gamma \in \mathrm{Dom}(p_\zeta) : q_\zeta \restriction \gamma \nVdash_{\mathbb{P}_\gamma} \text{"}p_\zeta(\gamma) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q_\zeta(\gamma)\text{"}\}$, so by the definition of $\mathscr{F}$-iteration, w_ζ is finite, and by the strategy of the interpolator we have $w_\zeta \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} \mathrm{Dom}(p_\varepsilon)$. So by Fodor lemma for some stationary $A_0 \subseteq A \cap E$ we have $\zeta \in A_0 \Rightarrow w_\zeta = w^*$.

Letting $w^* = \{\gamma_\ell : \ell < k\}$ such that $\gamma_\ell < \gamma_{\ell+1}$, we choose by induction on $\ell \le k$ a stationary set $A_\ell \subseteq \omega_1$ (from $\mathbf{V}$, of course) such that $A_{\ell+1} \subseteq A_\ell$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\gamma_\ell}(\langle \mathrm{val}^{\underset{\sim}{Q}_{\gamma_\ell}}(q_\zeta(\gamma_\ell)) : -1 \le \zeta < \omega_1\rangle, A_{\ell+1})$ is 1. For $\ell = 0, A_0$ has already been chosen, for $\ell + 1$, in $\mathbf{V}^{P_{\gamma_\ell}}$, we know that $\langle (p_{\xi(\gamma_\ell)+1+\zeta}(\gamma_\ell), q_{\xi(\gamma_\ell)+1+\zeta}(\gamma_\ell)) : \zeta < \omega_1\rangle$ is a play of the game $\Game_{p_\xi(\gamma)}[\mathbb{Q}_{\gamma_\ell}, \mathbf{H}_{\gamma_\ell}]$ in which the interpolator uses a winning strategy and $\langle (\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}_{\gamma_\ell}}(p_{\xi(\gamma_\ell)+1+\zeta}(\gamma_\ell),\ \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}_{\gamma_\ell}}(q_{\xi(\gamma_\ell)+1+\zeta})) : \zeta < \omega_1\rangle$ is a sequence of pairs from $\mathscr{F}^{[\gamma_\ell]}$, and the sequence is from $\mathbf{V}$. So there is a stationary $A_{\ell+1} \subseteq A_\ell$ as required above. Lastly, let $B =: A_{k^*}$, we shall prove that B is as required, that is, it satisfies clause (β) of 2.1(1), we concentrate on (β); the other clause, (γ) is similar and not really needed, suffice to get the finished variant. Let $\varepsilon < \zeta$ be from B and we shall find r as required. Stipulate $\gamma_k = \alpha^*$ and we now let $Y = \mathrm{Dom}(q_\zeta) \cup \{\alpha^*\}$ and we choose by induction on $\gamma \in Y$ a condition $r_\gamma \in \mathbb{P}_\gamma$ such that (we ignore the "semi" version, which requires just special treatment for $\gamma = 0$)

- (i) $q_\varepsilon \restriction \gamma \le r_\gamma$ and
- (ii) $q_\zeta \restriction \gamma \le r_\gamma$ and
- (iii) $\gamma = \beta + 1\ \ \&\ \ \beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(r_\gamma) \backslash w^* \Rightarrow r_\gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\gamma}$ "$q_\varepsilon(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} r_\gamma(\beta)$ and $q_\zeta(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} r_\gamma(\beta)$"
- (iv) if $\beta \in Y \cap \gamma$ and $[\beta, \gamma] \cap w^* = \emptyset$ then $r_\beta = r_\gamma \restriction \beta$

Case 1: $\gamma = \mathrm{Min}(Y)$.

Let $r_\gamma = \emptyset$, the empty function.

Case 2: $\gamma \ne \mathrm{Min}(Y)$ but $\gamma \cap Y$ has no last element.

Let $r_\gamma = \cup\{r_\beta : \beta \in \gamma \cap Y\}$, now check; it is a well defined function by clause (iv). We use here "$\mathscr{F}$ is fully based on α", see Definition 1.1(5) to show $r_\gamma \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$. Lastly note that for checking $q_\zeta \restriction \gamma \le r_\gamma$ and $q_\varepsilon \restriction \gamma \le r_\gamma$ we are using clause (iii).

Case 3: $Y \cap \gamma$ has last element $\beta, \beta \notin w^*$ and $\beta \notin \mathrm{Dom}(q_\varepsilon)$.

We let $r_\gamma(\beta) = q_\zeta(\gamma)$.

Case 4: $Y \cap \gamma$ has last element $\beta, \beta \notin w^*$ but $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(q_\varepsilon)$.

Now, r_β necessarily forces that

$(*)$ $p_\varepsilon(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} p_\zeta(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q_\zeta(\beta)$
and $p_\varepsilon(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q_\varepsilon(\beta)$.

So by clause (γ) of Definition 2.1(1), r_β forces that in $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ there is r such that $q_\zeta(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} r, q_\varepsilon(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} r$, and $\mathrm{val}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(r)$ is as it should be by clause (δ) of 2.1(1) (so is an object, not just a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name). Lastly let $r_\gamma(\beta)$ be a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name of such a condition.

Case 5: $Y \cap \gamma$ has last element $\beta, \beta = \gamma_\ell \in w^*$.

By the choice of $A_{\ell+1}$, we know $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$p_\zeta(\beta), q_\zeta(\beta)$ are $\le^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}$ compatible". So, for some $r'_\beta, r_\beta \le^{\mathbb{P}_\beta} r'$, for some $x \in \mathscr{F}^{[\beta]} r'$ forces that some $\le^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}$-common upper bound $\underset{\sim}{r}$" of $p_\zeta(\beta), q_\zeta(\beta)$, satisfies $\mathrm{val}^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(\underset{\sim}{r}'') = x$, and let $r_\gamma = r'_\beta \cup \{(\beta, \underset{\sim}{r}'')\}$.

So we are done. $\square_{2.12}$

2.13 Claim. *Assume $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a [Knastner] explicit [semi] $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration.* *Then* *$Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ satisfies the [Knastner/semi] explicit $\mathscr{F}$-psc.*

Proof. Similar to 2.12.

2.14 Discussion: We may consider replacing stationary $A, B \subseteq \omega_1$ by a subset of $[\omega_1]^2$, so we use:

2.15 Definition. We call $(\mathfrak{H}, <_{\mathfrak{H}})$ is c.c.c. witness if:

- (a) $\le_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is a partial order of $\mathfrak{H}$
- (b) $\mathfrak{H} \subseteq \mathscr{P}([\omega_1]^2)\backslash\{\emptyset\}$
- (c) for any $X \in \mathfrak{H}$, club E of ω_1 and a pressing down function h on E for some $Y \le_{\mathfrak{H}} X$ we have $h \restriction \cup\big\{\{\alpha, \beta\} : \{\alpha, \beta\} \in \mathfrak{Y}\big\}$ is constant.

§3 Nicer pure properness and pure decidability

3.1 Claim. *Let* $\mathscr{F}$ *be a trunk controller over* α^{**} *and* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ *be a semi* $\mathscr{F}$*-psc iteration and is semi-straight (see 2.1(6)) and* $\alpha^* = \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$.
1) If $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} : \omega \rightarrow$ *Ord*", *then we can find* q *and* $\mathscr{I}_n(n < \omega)$ *such that:* $p \le_{\rm pr} q \in \mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$ *and for each* $n < \omega$ *we have:*

$(*)_{q,\mathscr{I}_n,\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n)}$

- (a) $q \in \mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$
- (b) $\mathscr{I}_n \subseteq \{r : q \le_{\rm apr} r$ *and* r *forces a value to* $\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n)\}$
- (c) $\mathscr{I}_n$ *is countable*
- (d) $\mathscr{I}_n$ *is predense over* q.

2) If above $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ *is a strong semi* $\mathscr{F}$*-psc iteration and* $\{p,\bar{\mathbb{Q}}\} \in N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi),\in)$ *and* N *is countable and* $\langle \underset{\sim}{\tau}(n) : n < \omega\rangle$ *list the* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$*-names of ordinals from* N, *then we can add*

- (e) q *is* $(N,\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*})$*-generic.*

3) Assume $\mathbb{Q}$ *is an* $\mathscr{F}$*-iteration and:*

- (a) $\beta^* \le \alpha^*$ *and* $\beta \in [\beta^*,\alpha^*)$ *implies* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ *has pure* $(2,2)$*-decidability", see Definition 1.18*
- (b) $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}$ *is a* $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$*-name,* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}} \in \{0,1\}$"
- (c) $(*)_{p,\mathscr{I},\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}}$ *holds*
- (d) *each* $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ *(for* $\beta \in [\beta^*,\alpha^*)$*) satisfies* $p' \le_{\rm pr} p'' \Rightarrow val^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(p') = val^{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta}(p'')$.

Then there are $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}', q'$ *such that:*

$$p \le_{\rm pr} q'$$

$$q' \restriction \beta^* = p \restriction \beta^*$$

$$\mathbf{t}' \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}_{\beta^*}\text{-name}$$

$$q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}} \text{“}\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}' = \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}\text{”}.$$

4) Similarly for pure $(\aleph_0, 2)$*-decidability.*

Proof. 1) Assume not and let $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$ be a witness for "$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc" hence by 2.12 some $\mathbf{H}$ witness P_{α^*} is $\mathscr{F}$-pcf. So simulate a play of the game $\Game_p = \Game_{p,\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*},\mathbf{H}}$, where the interpolator plays using a fixed winning strategy whereas the extendor chooses q_ζ and $n_\zeta \le \omega$ such that:

- (α) $p'_\zeta \le q_\zeta$ (see notation in 2.1(1))
  (i.e. a legal move)
- (β) $n_\zeta \le \omega$ is minimal n such that $\{q_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta, n_\varepsilon = n$, and q_ε forces a value of $\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n)\}$ is not predense over p^*_ζ
- (γ) if $n_\zeta < \omega, q_\zeta$ forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n_\zeta)$, call it j_ζ
- (δ) if $n_\zeta < \omega$ then q_ζ is incompatible with q_ε if $\varepsilon < \zeta$ & $n_\varepsilon = n_\zeta$.

Now

- ⊠ for some $\zeta, n_\zeta = \omega$.
  Why? Otherwise the extendor can choose q_ζ for every $\zeta < \omega_1$, and $n_\zeta = n^*$ for every $\zeta \in [\zeta^*, \omega_1)$ for some ζ^*; in the end $\zeta^* < \varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow q_\varepsilon, q_\zeta$ are incompatible (as $j_\varepsilon \ne j_\zeta$) but the interpolator has to win the play (as he has used his winning strategy), contradicting clauses $(\beta) + (\gamma)$ of 2.1(1).

So necessarily for some $\zeta < \omega_1, n_\zeta = \omega$. Let p^* be: p if $\zeta = 0, p_{\zeta-1}$ if ζ is a successor ordinal and p'_ζ if ζ is a limit ordinal, so $p \le_{\rm pr} p^*$ by the definition of the game. For each $\varepsilon < \zeta$ let q'_ε be a $\le$-lub of q_ε, p^*, exists as $\mathbb{Q}$ is straight, so $p^* \le_{pr} q'_\varepsilon$. Let $\mathscr{I}_n = \{q'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta^*$ and $n_\varepsilon = n\}$ and we shall show that $p^*, \mathscr{I}_n$ are as required (p^* standing for q). Now clauses (a), (b), (c) are obvious, toward clause (d) assume $n < \omega, p^* \le q$ and q is incompatible with all members of $\mathscr{I}_n$ and let $\zeta_n = \text{Min}\{\zeta : n_\zeta > n\}$, so q could not have been a good candidate for q_{ζ_n} hence is compatible with some $q_\varepsilon, n_\varepsilon = n$. So by the choice of q'_ε clearly $q'_\varepsilon \le q$ and $q'_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{I}_n$, contradiction.

2) Essentially the same proof.

3) Case 1: $\text{Dom}(p) \subseteq \beta^*$.
Trivial.

Case 2: $\text{Dom}(p) \backslash \beta^* \ne \emptyset$.

For each $\beta \in [\beta^*, \alpha^*)$ we define $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-names $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^0_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta, \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^2_\beta, \underset{\sim}{q}_\beta$ as follows. Let $\text{Dom}^+(p) = \text{Dom}(p) \cup \{\cup\{\gamma + 1 : \gamma \in \text{Dom}(p)\}\}$. Let $G_\beta \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\beta$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$.

Possibility A: There are $q \in \mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}/G_\beta$ such that $p \le_{\rm pr} q$, $\text{Dom}(q) = \text{Dom}(p)$ and $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}/G_\beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}} = \ell$".

Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta[G_\beta]$ be 1 and $\mathbf{t}^0_\beta[G_\beta] = \ell$ and let $\underset{\sim}{q}_\beta[G_\beta]$ be $(p \restriction \beta) \cup (q \restriction [\beta, \alpha^*]$.

Possibility B: Not possibility A.
Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^0_\beta[G_{\beta^*}] = 0, \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta[G_\beta] = 0$ and $\underset{\sim}{q}_\beta[G_\beta] = p$.

In the first possibility, note that we have demanded $\mathrm{Dom}(q) = \mathrm{Dom}(p)$; in the second posibility this holds automatically.

Let $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^2_\beta[G_\beta] \in \{0,1\}$ be 1 iff $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta[G_\beta] = 0$ and for no $\gamma \in \beta \cap \mathrm{Dom}(p) \backslash \beta^*$ do we have $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\gamma[G_\beta \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma] = 1$, clearly also $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^2_\beta$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name of a number $\in \{0,1\}$.

Now note

$$\boxtimes \ \Vdash_{P_{\alpha^*}} \text{“there is one and only one } \beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \backslash \beta^* \text{ such that } \mathbf{t}^2_\beta[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\beta] = 1 \text{ call it } \underset{\sim}{\beta}\text{”}$$

(the “at most one” follows by the definition of $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^2_\beta$, and the “at least one” is by the finiteness clause in the definition of $\le^{\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}}$). So we can define $q \in \mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*} : \mathrm{Dom}(p) = \mathrm{Dom}(q)$, for $\gamma \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$: if $\gamma \ge \beta^*$ and $\gamma \ge \underset{\sim}{\beta}$ then $q(\gamma) = \underset{\sim}{q}_{\underset{\sim}{\beta}}(\gamma)$, otherwise $g(\gamma) = p(\gamma)$.

Now for each $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(p) \backslash \beta^*$ we define a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name $q^{[\beta]} \in \underset{\sim}{Q}_\beta$, such that:

- (α) $q(\beta) \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q^{[\beta]}$ and
- (β) $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q^{[\beta]}) = \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(p(\beta))$ [note this does not work well with associativity of iterations] and
- (γ) if $\ell \le 2$, and there are $q', \underset{\sim}{i}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ “$q \le_{pr} q'$ and $q' \Vdash_{\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta} \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^\ell_{\beta+1} = \underset{\sim}{i}$” where $\underset{\sim}{i}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name, then $(q^{[\beta]}, \underset{\sim}{i}_\ell)$ satisfy this for some $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name $\underset{\sim}{i}_\beta$ of a number < 2.

Let $q^* \in \mathbb{P}_\beta$, $\mathrm{Dom}(q^*) = \mathrm{Dom}(q)$, $q^* \restriction \beta^* = q \restriction \beta^*$ and $\beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(q) \backslash \beta^* \Rightarrow q^*(\beta) = q^{[\beta]}$. We can find $G_{\alpha^*} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$ generic over $\mathbf{V}$ satisfying $q^* \in G_{\alpha^*}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}[G^\ell_\alpha] = \ell$ for some $\ell \in \{0,1\}$. Now:

- $(*)_1$ for some $\beta \in [\beta^*, \alpha^*] \cap \mathrm{Dom}^+(p)$ we have $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta[G^\ell_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\beta] = 1$
  [why? as $p \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q^* \in G_{\alpha^*}$, by assumption (c) necessarily $\mathscr{I} \cap G^\ell_{\alpha^*} \ne \emptyset$ so let $r \in \mathscr{I} \cap G^\ell_{\alpha^*}$, and so $\beta = \alpha^*$ is as required.]

So let $\beta \in [\beta^*, \alpha^*]$ be minimal such that $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_\beta[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\beta] = 1$

- $(*)_2$ β cannot be a limit ordinal $> \beta^*$
  [why? by the finiteness clause in the definition of order in $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha^*}$]

$(*)_3$ $\beta = \gamma + 1 > \beta^*$ is impossible.
[Why? If $\gamma \notin \mathrm{Dom}(p)$ this is trivial by the choice of β, so assume $\gamma \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)$. Now in $\mathbf{V}[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma]$ the forcing notion $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\gamma[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma]$ has pure $(2,2)$-decidability hence clearly $q^{[\gamma]}[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma] \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_\gamma}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^\ell_{\gamma+1} = \underset{\sim}{i}^\ell_\gamma[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma]$". Now $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{t}}^1_{\gamma+1}[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_{\gamma+1}] = 1$ by the choice of $\beta = \gamma+1$, hence $\underset{\sim}{i}^1_\gamma[G_{\alpha^*} \cap \mathbb{P}_\gamma] = 1$. Define $q' : q' \restriction \beta = q^* \restriction \beta, p' \restriction (\mathrm{Dom}(p)) \backslash \beta) = \underset{\sim}{q}_\beta \restriction (\mathrm{Dom}(p) \backslash \beta)$ it proves γ could serve instead β, contradiction.]

So $\beta_\ell = \beta^*$ and we are easily done by the definition of $\underset{\sim}{p}$.

4) Similar to the proof of part (3). $\square_{3.1}$

3.2 Definition. 1) Let $S \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ be stationary. We say that $\mathbb{Q}$, is purely $(S, \mathscr{F})$-proper if $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ is countable, $N \cap \lambda \in S, \mathbb{Q}, \mathscr{F} \in N, p \in \mathbb{Q} \cap N$ then there is q such that:

- (a) $p \le_{pr} q \in \mathbb{Q}$
- (b) q is $(N, \mathbb{Q})$-generic
- (c) $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{Q}}(q) = \mathrm{prop}_{\mathscr{F}}(p, N \cap S)$, as usual $\mathrm{prop}_{\mathscr{F}}$ is considered part of $\mathscr{F}$.

3.3 Claim. *In 3.1(2) we can conclude $\mathbb{Q}$ is purely $(([\lambda]^{\aleph_0}), \mathscr{F})$-proper.*

Proof. Read the claims and definitions.

We can also generalize the preservation theorems.

3.4 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) *$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathscr{F}$ are as in 3.2*
- (b) *$(D, R, <)$ is a fine covering[5] model in the sense of [Sh:f, VI,Definition 1.x]*
- (c) *$E \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\mathbb{Q}_\beta$ is purely $(D_1, R, <)$-preserving*
- (d) *each $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is purely preserving.*

2) Similary for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ a Knaster explictly semi $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration.

Proof. See [Sh:f, VI,1.13A,p.270].

---

[5] can use also the weaker version there

§4
AVERAGES BY AN ULTRAFILTER AND RESTRICTED NON NULL TREES

4.1 Claim. *Assume*

(*a*) $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{r}]$ *where* $\mathbf{r}$ *is a random real over* $\mathbf{V}$

(*b*) *in* $\mathbf{V}, D$ *is a non principal ultrafilter on* ω.

Then we can find in $\mathbf{V}_1$ *a non principal ultrafilter* D_1 *on* ω *extending* D *such that*

$(*)_{\mathbf{r},D,D_1}$ *Assume in* $\mathbf{V}, (\mathscr{B}, \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega\rangle)$ *is a candidate (or a* $(D,\mathbf{V})$*-candidate which means that (all this in* $\mathbf{V}$*),* $\mathscr{B}, \mathscr{B}_n$ *are Borel subsets of* ${}^\omega 2$ *and* $(\forall k < \omega)(\exists B \in D)(\forall n \in B)[Leb(\mathscr{B}\Delta\mathscr{B}_n) < 1/(k+1)]$.
Then the following conditions are equivalent in $\mathbf{V}_1$*:*

(*i*) $\mathbf{r} \in \bigcup\limits_{n\in B} \mathscr{B}_n$ *for every* $B \in D$ *(recall,* $\mathscr{B}_n$ *being a Borel set, is actually a definition of a set and so* $\bigcup\limits_{n\in B} \mathscr{B}_n$ *is a definition in* $\mathbf{V}$ *of a Borel set, so it defines a Borel set in* $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{r}]$*)*

(*ii*) *the set* $\{n : \mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{B}_n\}$ *belongs to* D_1.

Proof. Clearly $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. So it suffices to find in $\mathbf{V}_1$ an ultrafilter D_1 over ω containing $D' = D \cup \{\{n : \mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{B}_n\} : (\mathscr{B}, \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega\rangle) \text{ is a candidate}\}$. This is equivalent to "any intersection of finitely many members of D' is not empty. As D is closed under finite intersection. Clearly it suffices to prove:

⊠ Assume in $\mathbf{V}$ that $m^* < \omega$ and for each $m < m^*, (\mathscr{B}_m, \langle \mathscr{B}_{m,n} : n < \omega\rangle$ is a candidate and $B \in D$.
Then for some $n \in B$ in $\mathbf{V}_1$ we have $m < m^* \Rightarrow [\mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{B}_m \equiv \mathbf{r} \in \mathscr{B}_{m,n}]$.

Proof of ⊠. It is enough, given a positive real $\varepsilon > 0$ to find a Borel set $\mathscr{B} = \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{V}$ of Lebesgue measure $< \varepsilon$ such that

$(*)$ $r \in {}^\omega 2 \backslash \mathscr{B} \Rightarrow (\exists n \in B)(\forall m < m^*)[r \in \mathscr{B}_m \equiv r \in \mathscr{B}_{m,n}]$

(as then we can find in $\mathbf{V}$ a sequence $\langle \mathscr{B}_{1/(k+1)} : k < \omega\rangle$, each $\mathscr{B}_{1/(k+1)}$ as above; so $\mathbf{r}$ being random over $\mathbf{V}$ does not belong to $\bigcap\limits_k \mathscr{B}_{1/(k+1)}$ hence for some $k, \mathbf{r} \notin$

$\mathscr{B}_{(1/(k+1)}$ and so there is n as required by $(*)$ because $(*)$ holds also in $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{r}]$ by absoluteness).

Given ε, for $m < m^*$, as $(\mathscr{B}_m, \langle \mathscr{B}_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle)$ is a candidate we can find $B'_m \in D$ such that $(\forall n \in B'_m)([\text{Leb}(\mathscr{B}_m \Delta \mathscr{B}_{m,n}) < \varepsilon/(m^*+1)]$. Let $B'' = \bigcap\limits_{m<m^*} B'_m \cap B$, so clearly $B'' \in D$; now for any $n \in B''$, the Borel set $\mathscr{B} = \bigcup\limits_{m<m^*} (\mathscr{B}\Delta\mathscr{B}_{m,n})$ will do: clearly $\text{Leb}(\mathscr{B}) < \varepsilon$ and easily n is as required. $\square_{4.1}$

We can do the following more generally, but the following was our required example.

4.2 Definition. If $g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ satisfies $n < \omega \Rightarrow g(n) > n$ and is increasing we define $\mathbf{T}_g$ as the family of subtrees T of ${}^{\omega>}2$ such that for every $n < \omega$ and $\eta \in T \cap {}^n 2$ we have[6]

$$(*)_n \qquad (1-1/n)|T^{[\eta]} \cap {}^{g(n)}2|/2^{g(n)} \leq \ \text{Leb}(\lim(T^{[\eta]})) \leq |T^{[\eta]} \cap {}^{g(n)}2|/2^{g(n)}$$

(the second inequality holds automatically), equivalently, for $m \geq g(n)$

$$(*)_{n,m} \qquad (1-1/n)|T^{[\eta]} \cap {}^{g(n)}2|/2^{g(n)} \leq |T^{[\eta]} \cap {}^m 2|/2^m \leq |T^{[\eta]} \cap {}^{g(n)}2|/2^{g(n)}.$$

4.3 Definition. : 1) For subtrees T_n of ${}^{\omega>}2$ for $n < \omega$ and filter D on ω we say $T = \ \lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle$ if $T = \{\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 : \{n < \omega : \eta \in T_n\} \in D\} = \{\eta \in {}^{\omega>}2 : \{n < \omega : \eta \notin T_n\} \neq \emptyset \mod D\}$. Similarly for $T_n \subseteq \mathscr{H}(\aleph_0)$. We may omit D if D is the family co-bounded subset of ω. Note that $\lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle$ if it exists is uniquely defined and is absolute and if D is an ultrafilter it is always well defined.
2) Let $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$ be $\{g \in \mathbf{V} : g$ is an increasing function from ω to ω and $g(n) > n\}$, let $\mathscr{G}$ vary on subsets of $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$. Let $\mathbf{T}_{\mathscr{G}} = \cup\{\mathbf{T}_g : g \in \mathscr{G}\}$. Let $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}_w = \{g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}} : \text{Dom}(g) = w\}$.
3) For Borel subsets $\mathscr{B}, \mathscr{B}_n \ (n < \omega)$ of ${}^\omega 2$ and filter D on ω let $\mathscr{B} = \ \text{ms-lim}_D \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ for the set $\{n < \omega : \text{Leb}(\mathscr{B}\Delta\mathscr{B}_n) < \varepsilon\}$ belongs to D. Note that here $\mathscr{B}$ is not uniquely determined and this has been used in 4.1, $(*)_{\mathbf{r},D,D_1}$.

---

[6] recall $T^{[\eta]} = \{\nu \in T : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta \text{ or } \eta \triangleleft \nu\}$

4.4 Claim. *1) For subtrees T_n of ${}^{\omega>}2$ for $n < \omega$ and ultrafilter D on ω, $\mathit{lim}_D\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is well defined and is a subtree of ${}^{\omega>}2$.*
2) If in addition $n < \omega \Rightarrow T_n \in \mathbf{T}_g$ (as in Definition 4.2), then

- (a) *$\mathit{lim}_D\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ belongs to $\mathbf{T}_g$*
- (b) *if $T = \mathit{lim}_D\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ then $\mathit{lim}(T) = \text{ms-}\mathit{lim}_D\langle \mathit{lim}(T_n) : n < \omega\rangle$.*

Proof. Easy.

4.5 Definition. 1) We say $\rho \in {}^\omega 2$ is $(N, \mathbf{T}_{\mathscr{G}}, D)$-continuous or $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over N for D if:

- (a) $N \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ a transitive class, a model of ZFC, or $\prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ for some χ; or more generally, a set or a class, which is a model of enough set theory (say ZFC$^-$) and $\mathscr{H}(\aleph_0) \subseteq N, \omega \in N$, with reasonable absoluteness and $D \in N$ a filter on ω containing the co-finite sets (so $D^{\mathbf{V}}$ is the filter generated in $\mathbf{V}$ by $D \cap N$)
- (b) $\mathscr{G} \in N$ (and of course $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$) and if $m(*) < \omega$ and for each $m < m(*)$ we have $g_m \in \mathscr{G}$, and $\langle T^m_n : n < \omega\rangle \in N, T^m_n \in N \cap \mathbf{T}_{g_m}, T^m \in N \cap \mathbf{T}_g$ and $T^m = \lim_D\langle T^m_n : n < \omega\rangle$, then $\rho \in \bigcap\limits_{m<m^*} \lim(T^m) \Rightarrow \{n : \text{if } m < m^* \text{ then } \rho \in \lim(T^m_n)\} \neq \emptyset \mod D^{\mathbf{V}}$.

2) We define the ideal $\text{Null}_{\mathscr{G},D}$ as the σ-ideal generated by the sets of the form $\{\eta \in {}^\omega 2 : \rho \in \lim(T^m) \text{ for } m < m(*) \text{ but } \{n : \text{if } m < m(*) \text{ then } \rho \in \lim(T^m_n)\} = \emptyset \mod D\}$ with $T^m, T^m_n \in \mathbf{T}_{g_m}, \lim(T^m) = \lim_D\langle \lim(T^m_n) : n < \omega\rangle$, for some $m < m(*)$ where $m(*) < \omega, g_m \in \mathscr{G}$.
3) If D is the filter of co-finite subsets of ω, we may omit it.

4.6 Observation: 1) Assume $\mathscr{G} \in \mathbf{V}$ is $\neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{V}_1$ extends $\mathbf{V}$. If $({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ is not in the ideal $(\text{Null}_{\mathscr{G}})^{\mathbf{V}_1}$, then there is no $\rho \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ which is a Cohen real over $\mathbf{V}$.
2) If D is an ultrafilter on ω (in $\mathbf{V}$), then in Definition 4.5(1),(2) the case $m(*) = 1$ suffice.

Proof. 1) Choose $g \in \mathscr{G}$ and choose $\langle m_i : i < \omega\rangle$ by $m_0 = 0, m_{i+1} = 2g(m_i) > m_i$.

Assume toward contradiction $\rho \in {}^\omega 2$ is Cohen over $\mathbf{V}$. On ${}^\alpha 2, \alpha \leq \omega$ let $+$ be addition mod 2 coordinatewise.

In $\mathbf{V}$ we can find a sequence $\langle T_i : i < \omega\rangle$ of subtrees of ${}^{\omega>}2$ such that: $\text{Leb}(\lim(T_i)) \geq 1 - 1/2^i, {}^{n\geq}2 \subseteq T_n$ and $i \leq j < \omega \;\&\; \eta \in T_i \cap {}^{n_j}2 \rightarrow (\exists! \nu)(\eta \triangleleft \nu \in {}^{(m_{j+1})}2 \;\&\; \nu \notin T_i)$. So easily $T_i \in \mathbf{T}_g$ and $T =: \lim_D\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is ${}^{\omega>}2$. Now if $\nu \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$

then $\rho + \nu$ is Cohen over $\mathbf{V}$ hence $\notin \lim(T_n)$ hence $\nu \notin \rho + \lim(T_n)$. So letting $T'_n = \{\nu + \rho \restriction k : \nu \in T_n \cap {}^k 2, k < \omega\}$, still $\lim\langle T'_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is $T = {}^{\omega >}2$ and for every $\nu \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ we have $n < \omega \Rightarrow \nu \notin \lim(T'_n)$ but $\nu \in \lim(T)$. So $T, \langle T'_n : n < \omega\rangle$ exemplify that $({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ is in $\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G}}$, contradiction.
2) Easy to check. $\square_{4.6}$

4.7 Conclusion. Assume

(a) $\mathbf{V}_1 \supseteq \mathbf{V}$

(b) $\mathscr{G} \in \mathbf{V}, \mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$

(c) in $\mathbf{V}, D$ is a non principal ultrafilter on ω.

(d) $\mathbf{r} \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}$ (recall 4.5(3)).

Then we can find D_1 such that

(α) D_1 is a non principal ultrafilter on ω extending D

(β) if $g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$ and $T, \langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle \in \mathbf{V}, \{T, T_n\} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_g$ and $T = \lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$ then

$$\{n : (\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T)) \equiv (\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T_n))\} \in D_1.$$

Proof. To find such D_1, it is enough to prove

⊠ assume

$(*)_1$ $m^* < \omega$ and for $m < m^*, g_m \in \mathscr{G}, T^m, T^m_n \in \mathbf{T}_{g_m} (\subseteq \mathbf{V}))$ for $n < \omega$ and $\langle T^m_n : n < \omega\rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ and $T^m = \lim_D \langle T^n_m : m < \omega\rangle$ and lastly $B \in D$.

Then for some $n \in B$ we have $(\forall m < m^*)(\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m) \equiv \mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_n))$.

For $m < m^*$ we can find $k_m < \omega$ such that $\mathbf{r} \notin \lim(T^m) \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \restriction k_m \notin T^m$ hence $k = \max\{k_m : m < m^*\} < \omega$ and let $u = \{k < m^* : \mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m)\}$. For each $m < m^*, m \notin u$ we know that $\mathbf{r} \restriction k \notin T^m$ hence $A_m =: \{n : \mathbf{r} \restriction k_m \notin T^m_n\} \in D$, and clearly $n \in A_m \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \restriction k_m \notin T^m_n \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \restriction k \in T^m_n$. Let $B_1 = B \cap \bigcap\{A_m : m < m^*, m \notin u\}$, clearly $B_1 \in \mathbf{V}$ and $B_1 \in D$ hence B_1 is infinite. So we can choose by induction on $i < \omega$, a number $n_i \in B_1$ such that $n_i > n_j$ for $j < i$ and $m < m^* \Rightarrow T^m_{n_i} \cap {}^{i\geq}2 = T^m \cap {}^{i\geq}2$ moreover we do this in $\mathbf{V}$ (possible as $\mathbf{r} \restriction k_m \in \mathbf{V}$ for $m < m^*$). By the definition of "$\mathbf{r}$ is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}$", the Borel set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{B} = \{\eta \in {}^{\omega}2 : \eta \in \cap\{\lim(T^m) : m \in u\} \text{ but} \\ \{i < \omega : \eta \in \cap\{\lim(T^m_{n_i}) : m \in u\}\} \text{ is finite}\}\}\end{aligned}$$

satisfies: $\mathbf{r} \notin \mathscr{B}^{\mathbf{V}_1}$. But $\mathbf{r} \in \cap\{\lim(T^m) : m \in u\}$ by the choice of u hence by the definition of $\mathscr{B}$ we have $\mathbf{r} \in \cap\{\lim(T^m_{n_i}) : m \in u\}$, for infinitely many i's. Hence for some i

- $(*)$ $m \in u \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_{n_i})$.

Now if $m < m^*, m \notin u$ then $\mathbf{r} \notin \lim(T^m)$ by the choice of u and $\mathbf{r} \notin \lim(T^m_{n_i})$ as $n_i \in B_1 \subseteq A_m$, see above. So n_i is as required. $\square_{4.7}$

§5 On iterating $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$

5.1 Definition. 1) Let **IF** be the family of $\bar D = \langle D_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega\rangle$ with each D_η a filter on ω containing all the co-finite subsets of ω.
2) **IUF** is the family of $\bar D = \langle D_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega\rangle$ with each D_η a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω.

On $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ see [JdSh 321].

5.2 Definition. 1) For $\bar D \in$ **IF** we define $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ as follows:

- (α) the set of elements is $Q_{\bar D} = \{T : T \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\omega$ is closed under initial segments, is nonempty and for some member $\text{tr}(T) \in T$, the trunk, we have: $\nu \in T$ & $\ell g(\nu) \le \ell g(\eta) \Rightarrow \nu \trianglelefteq \eta$ and $\eta \trianglelefteq \nu \in T \Rightarrow \{n : \nu\char`\^\langle n\rangle \in T\} \ne \emptyset \mod D_\nu\}$
- (β) $\le = \le^{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}$ is the inverse of inclusion
- (γ) $\le_{\text{pr}} = \le^{Q_{\bar D}}_{\text{pr}}$ is defined by $T_1 \le_{\text{pr}} T_2 \equiv (T_2 \subseteq T_1 \;\&\; \text{tr}(T_1) = \text{tr}(T_2))$
- (δ) $\le_{apr} = \{(p,q) : p \le q$ and $q = p^{[\eta]}$ for some $\eta \in p\}$ on $p^{[\eta]}$ see below
- (ε) $\text{val}(T) = \text{tr}(T) \in \mathscr{H}(\aleph_0)$.

2) Let $\underset{\sim}{\eta} = \underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}) = \underset{\sim}{\eta}_{\bar D}$ be $\cup\{\text{tr}(p) : p \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}\}$, this is a $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$-name of a member of ${}^\omega\omega$.
For $p \in Q_{\bar D}, \eta \in p$ let $p^{[\eta]} = \{\nu \in p : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta \vee \eta \trianglelefteq \nu\}$; so we have $p \le p^{[\eta]} \in Q_{\bar D}$, $\text{tr}(p^{[\eta]}) \in \{\eta, tr(p)\}$.

<u>5.3 Fact</u>: For $\bar D \in$ **IUF**, we have:

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ is a straight clear simple $\mathscr{F}$-forcing, σ-centered, purely proper if ${}^{\omega>}\omega \subseteq \mathscr{F}$
- (b) $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-psc if ${}^{\omega>}\omega \subseteq \mathscr{F}$
- (c) from $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}]$ we can reconstruct $\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}$ so it is a generic real
- (d) $p \le_{apr} p^{[\eta]} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ for $\eta \in p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$.

Proof. Immediate, being σ-centered using 2.5(2) with $\{R_n : n < \omega\} = \{\{p \in Q_{\bar D} : \text{tr}(p) = \eta\} : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega\}$. $\square_{5.3}$

For completeness we prove the basic properties of $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$.

5.4 Claim. *For* $\bar{D} \in$ **IUF** *letting* $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ *we have*
1) $\mathbb{Q}$ *has pure 2-decidability.*
2) If $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ *and* $\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ *is dense above* p, $\underline{\textit{then}}$ *for some* q *we have* $p \leq_{pr} q$ *and* $Y_0 = \{\eta \in p :$ *there is* q *such that* $p^{[\eta]} \leq_{\text{pr}} q \in \mathscr{I}\}$ *contains a front of* q *(that is* $\eta \in$ *lim*$(p) \Rightarrow (\exists n)[\eta \restriction n \in Y]$*).*
3) If $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ *and* $Y \subseteq p$ *satisfies* $\eta \in Y \ \& \ \eta \triangleleft \nu \in p \Rightarrow \nu \in Y$, $\underline{\textit{then}}$ *there is* q *such that* $p \leq_{pr} q$ *and: either* $q \cap Y = \emptyset$ *or there is a function* $h : q \backslash Y \backslash \{\nu : \nu \triangleleft tr(q)\} \rightarrow \omega_1$ *such that for* $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ *in Dom*$(h), h(\eta) > h(\nu)$ *and* $(\forall \eta \in$ *Dom*$(h))(\forall k < \ell g(\eta))[\eta \restriction k \in$ *Dom*$(h)]$*.*
4) Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}, \mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$*.* $\underline{\textit{Then}}$ $\mathscr{I}$ *is predense above* p *(in* $\mathbb{Q}$*)* $\underline{\textit{iff}}$ *there is* $\langle (p_\eta, h_\eta) : tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p \rangle, \langle q_\eta : \eta \in Y \rangle$ *such that:*

- (a) $p^{[\eta]} \leq_{pr} p_\eta \in \mathbb{Q}$
- (b) *if* $tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p$ *then* $\eta \in Y$ *or* h_η *is a function with domain a subset of* $\{\nu : \eta \trianglelefteq \nu \in p_\eta\}$ *closed under initial segments, range of* h_η *is* $\subseteq \omega_1, h_\eta$ *decreasing (i.e.* $\rho \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow h(\rho) > h(\nu)$ *when* $\rho, \nu \in$ *Dom*(h_η)*) and* $\nu \in$ *Dom*$(h_\eta) \wedge \nu\hat{\ }\langle \ell \rangle \in p_\eta \backslash$ *Dom*$(h_\eta) \Rightarrow \nu \in Y$
- (c) $q_\eta \in \mathscr{I}$ *and* $tr(q_\eta) \trianglelefteq \eta \in q_\eta$*.*

Proof. Straight, but we give details.
1) Let $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \{0,1\}$". Let $Y_0 =: \{\eta \in p : tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta$ and there is $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ forcing a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ such that $p^{[\eta]} \leq_{pr} q\}$ and let $Y =: \{\eta \in p :$ for some $\nu \in Y_0$ we have $tr(p) \trianglelefteq \nu \trianglelefteq \eta\}$. We apply part (3), (trivially Y is as assumed there) so let $p \leq_{pr} q \in \mathbb{Q}$ be as there. If $q \cap Y = \emptyset$ let r be such that $q \leq r$ and r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$; hence $tr(r) \in q \cap Y$, contradiction. So there is h as there. Stipulate $h(\nu) = -1$ if $\nu \in Y$. We prove by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ (and $\alpha \geq -1$) that:

$(*)_\alpha$ if $tr(q) \trianglelefteq \eta \in$ Dom(h) and $h(\eta) = \alpha$ $\underline{\text{then}}$ there is $r = r_\eta$ such that $tr(q) \trianglelefteq tr(r_\eta) \trianglelefteq \eta$ and r_η forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$.

Now if $\alpha = -1$ then (by the choice of (3)), $\eta \in Y$ hence (by the definition of Y) for some ν we have $tr(q) \trianglelefteq \nu \trianglelefteq \eta$ and $\nu \in Y_0$. Hence (by the definition of Y_0) there is r such that $q^{[\nu]} \leq_{pr} r \in \mathbb{Q}$ and r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ as required. If $\alpha \geq 0$ for each $\ell < \omega$ such that $\eta\hat{\ }\langle \ell \rangle \in q$ let $r_{\eta\hat{\ }<\ell>} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} = i_\ell$". If for some such $\ell, tr(r_{\eta\hat{\ }<\ell>}) \trianglelefteq \eta$ we are done, otherwise for some $i < 2$ we have $A =: \{\ell : i_\ell = i$ and so $\eta\hat{\ } < \ell > \in q$ and $tr(r_{\eta\hat{\ }<\ell>}) = \eta\hat{\ } < \ell >\} \in D_\eta$ and let $r_\eta = \cup\{r_{\eta\hat{\ }<\ell>} : \ell \in A\}$.

Having carried the induction, for $\alpha = h(tr(q)), r_{tr(q)}$ is as required: forced a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ and $tr(q) \trianglelefteq tr(r_{tr(q)}) \trianglelefteq tr(q)$ we have $tr(r_{tr(q)}) = tr(q)$ hence $q \leq_{pr} r_{tr(q)}$ but

$p \le_{pr} q$ hence $p \le_{pr} r_{tr(q)}$.
2) Let $Y = \{\eta :$ for some ν we have $tr(p) \trianglelefteq \nu \trianglelefteq \eta \in p$ and $\nu \in Y_0\}$. Apply part (3) to p and Y (clearly Y is as required there) and get q as there. If $q \cap Y = \emptyset$ find r such that $q \le r \in \mathscr{I}$, (exists by the density of $\mathscr{I}$) so by our definitions $tr(r) \in Y_0 \subseteq Y$ and $tr(r) \in r \subseteq q$ so $q \cap Y \neq \emptyset$, contradiction. So assume $q \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ hence necessarily there is h as there and for every $\eta \in \lim(q)$, as $\langle h(\eta \restriction \ell) : \ell \in [\ell g(tr(q)), \omega)\rangle$ cannot be strictly decreasing sequence of ordinals, necessarily for some $\ell \ge \ell g(tr(q)), \eta \restriction \ell \notin \mathrm{Dom}(h)$ hence $\eta \restriction \ell \in Y$ hence for some $m \in [\ell g(tr(q)), \ell]$ we have $\eta \restriction m \in Y_0$ contradicting our present assumption.
3) Let $Z = \{\eta : tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p$ and for $p^{[\eta]} \in \mathbb{Q}$ there is h as required in the claim$\}$. Clearly

- $(*)_1$ $Y \subseteq Z \subseteq \{\eta : tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p\}$ (use h_η with $\mathrm{Dom}(h_\eta) = \{\eta\}, h_\eta(\eta) = 0$
- $(*)_2$ if $tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p$ and $A = \{\ell : \eta\hat{\ }\langle \ell \rangle \in Z\} \in D_\eta$ then $\eta \in Z$.
  [Why? If h_ℓ witness $\eta\hat{\ }\langle \ell \rangle \in Z$ for $\ell \in A$, let $\alpha^* = \cup\{h_\ell(\eta\hat{\ }\langle \ell \rangle) + 1 : \ell \in A\}$ and define $h : \mathrm{Dom}(h) = \{\nu : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta\} \cup \cup\{\mathrm{Dom}(h_\ell) \backslash \{\nu : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta\} : \ell \in A\}, h \restriction (\mathrm{Dom}(h_\ell) \backslash \{\nu : \nu \trianglelefteq \eta\})$ is $h_\ell, h(\nu) = \alpha^* + \ell g(\eta) - \ell g(\nu)$ if $\nu \trianglelefteq \ell g(\eta)$.]

If $tr(p) \in Z$ we get the second possibility in the conclusion. If $tr(p) \notin Z$, let $q = p \backslash \{\eta \in p$: there is no $\nu \trianglelefteq \eta$ which belongs to $Z\}$, so $\{\eta : \eta \trianglelefteq tr(p)\} \subseteq q$ (see Z's definition + present assumption) and q is closed under initial segments (read its definition) and by $(*)_2$ we can prove by induction on $\ell \ge \ell g(tr(p))$ that $\eta \in q \cap {}^n\omega$ implies $\{n : \eta\hat{\ } < n > \in q\} \in D_\eta$. So clearly $p \le_{pr} q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}, q \cap Y = \emptyset$ as required.
4) Should be clear. $\square_{5.4}$

The following is natural to note if we are interested in the Borel conjecture. (Of course, this claim does not touch the problem of preserving this by the later forcings in the interation we intend to use.) Compare with 5.7.

5.5 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\bar D = \langle D_\eta : \eta \in {}^\omega 2\rangle$ *where*
  D_η *is a non-principal ultrafilter on* ω
- (b) $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ *is countable,* $\bar D \in N$
- (c) $\rho_m \in {}^\omega\omega \backslash N$ *for* $m < \omega$
- (d) $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D} \cap N$.

__Then__ we can find q such that

- (α) $p \le_{\mathrm{pr}} q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$
- (β) $q \Vdash$ *"if* $f \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} (\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D})[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}](n) + 1)$ *and* $f \in N[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}]$ *and* $m < \omega$
  __then__ $(\forall^* n)(\neg f \restriction n \triangleleft \rho_m)$*".*

Proof. Let $\langle \underset{\sim}{f}_\ell : \ell < \omega\rangle$ list the $\underset{\sim}{f} \in N$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f} \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega}((\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}))(n)+1)$".

Now for every $tr(p) \trianglelefteq \eta \in p$ and $\ell < \omega$ there is a function $f_{\ell,\eta} \in {}^\omega(\omega+1)$ such that: for every $k < \omega$ there is $q_{\ell,\eta,k} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D} \cap N$ such that $q^{[\eta]} \le_{\rm pr} q_{\ell,\eta,k}$ and $q_{\ell,\eta,k} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}}$ "for $\ell, n < k$ we have: if $f_{\ell,\eta}(n) < \omega$ then $\underset{\sim}{f}_\ell(n) = f_{\ell,\eta}(n)$ and if $f_{\ell,\eta}(n) = \omega$ then $\underset{\sim}{f}_\ell(m) > k$".

Now $q_{\ell,\eta,k} \in N$ and without loss of generality $\langle q_{\ell,\eta,k} : \eta \in p$ and $k < \omega\rangle, \langle f_{\ell,\eta} : \eta \in p\rangle$ belongs to N (but we cannot have $\langle q_{\ell,\eta,k} : \eta \in p, k < \omega$ and $\ell < \omega\rangle \in N$). Now for each ℓ,η,k as $f_{\ell,\eta} \in N$ and $\rho_m \notin N$ clearly the set $\{n : f_{\ell,\eta}(n) \ne \rho_m(n)\}$ is infinite so let $k_0(\ell,\nu,m) = \text{ Min}\{k :$ if $m' < m$ then $f_{\ell,\nu} \restriction k \ne \rho_{m'} \restriction \ell\}$ and $k(\ell,\nu,m) = \text{ Min}\{k : k \ge k_0(\ell,\nu,m)$ and if $k' < k, \rho_{\ell,\nu}(k') = \omega$ then $k > \rho_m(k')\}$. Now define q as $\{\eta \in p :$ if $\nu \triangleleft \eta, \ell \le \ell g(\nu)$ and $m \le \ell g(\eta)$ then $\eta \in q_{\ell,\nu,k(\ell,\nu,m)}\}$.

The checking is straightforward. $\square_{5.5}$

5.6 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbf{V}_1$
- (b) $\mathscr{G} \in \mathbf{V}$ *and* $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$
- (c) $\bar D \in \mathbf{IUF}^{\mathbf{V}}$.

If $\bar D_1 \in \mathbf{IUF}^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ *and* $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega \Rightarrow D_\eta \subseteq D_{1,\eta}$ *then*

- (α) $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}$ *(so* $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D} = \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1} \cap \mathbf{V}$ *and* $\le_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}} [\mathbf{V}] = \le_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}} \restriction \mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D}$ *and similarly for incompatibility)*
- (β) *if in* $\mathbf{V}$ *we have "*$\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ *is predense over* $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$*" then in* $\mathbf{V}_1$ *we have "*$\mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D_1}$ *is predense over* p*"*
- (γ) *if* $G_1 \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}$ *is generic over* $\mathbf{V}_1$*, then* $G =: G_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D}[\mathbf{V}]$ *is a generic subset of* $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar D}$ *over* $\mathbf{V}$.

2) Assume in addition

- (d) $\mathbf{r} \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ *is* $\mathscr{G}$*-continuous over* $\mathbf{V}$.

If $D_{1,\eta}$ *extending* D_η *is chosen as in 4.5 for each* $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega$, *then* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}}$ "$\mathbf{r}$ *is* $\mathscr{G}$*-continuous over* $\mathbf{V}[\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1})]$".

Proof. 1) Clause (α) is obvious, clause (β) holds by 5.4(4), and clause (γ) follows (this is as in [Sh 700]).

2) So assume that $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}, m^* < \omega$ and for each $m < m^*, g_m \in \mathscr{G}$ and $\underset{\sim}{T}^m, \langle \underset{\sim}{T}^m_n : n < \omega\rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ are $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar{D}}$-names hence $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}$-names such that:

$(*)_0$ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{T}^m, \underset{\sim}{T}^m_n \in \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{T}}_{g_m}$ and $\underset{\sim}{T}^m = \lim\langle \underset{\sim}{T}_n : n < \omega\rangle$".

By the definition (4.5) we have to prove, for a given $n(*) < \omega$ for some $n(*) > n(**)$ and q above p (in $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$), q forces that: $m < m^* \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^n) \equiv \mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m_{n(*)})$. By the definition and what we need to prove, without loss of generality

$(*)_2$ $p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{T}^m \cap {}^{n\geq}2 = \underset{\sim}{T}^m_n \cap {}^{n\geq}2$" for $n < \omega, m < m^*$.

We shall for some $n < \omega$ find $p' \geq p$ in $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}$ such that $p' \Vdash$ "$(\mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m)) \equiv (\mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m_n))$ for every $m < m^*$", this suffices (see 4.6(2)); work in $\mathbf{V}$. Let $q_0 = ({}^{\omega>}\omega)$, so $q_0 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$, now we find $\langle T^m_\eta, T^m_{n,\eta} : \eta \in q_0, n < \omega\rangle$ of course in $\mathbf{V}$ such that:

$(*)_3(i)$ $T^m_\eta, T^m_{n,\eta} \subseteq {}^{\omega>}2$, for $n < \omega, m < m^*$

(ii) for every $\eta \in q_0$ and $k < \omega$ we can find $q^m_{\eta,k}, q^m_{n,\eta,k} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ such that:
$q^{[\eta]}_0 \leq_{\rm pr} q^m_{\eta,k}$,
$q^{[\eta]}_0 \leq_{\rm pr} q^m_{n,\eta,k}$
$q^m_{\eta,k} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{T}^m \cap {}^{k\geq}2 = T^m_\eta \cap {}^{k\geq}2$"
$q^m_{n,\eta,k} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{T}^m_n \cap {}^{k\geq}2 = T^m_{n,\eta} \cap {}^{k\geq}2$".

Now clearly

$(*)_4$(i) $T^m_\eta, T^m_{n,\eta} \in \mathbf{T}_{g_m}$

(ii) $T^m_\eta = \lim_{D_\eta}\langle T^m_{\eta\hat{}<k>} : k < \omega\rangle$

(iii) $T^m_{n,\eta} = \lim_{D_\eta}\langle T^m_{n,\eta\hat{}<k>\rangle} : k < \omega\rangle$.

Next note that

$(*)_5(a)$ $T^m_\eta, T^m_{n,k}$ belong to $\mathbf{T}_g$

(b) $T^m_\eta = \lim\langle T^m_{n,\eta} : n < \omega\rangle$.
[Why does clause (a) hold? Let $T^m_\eta \cap {}^{g(\ell)}2 = t$ then $q^m_{\eta,k}$ forces that $\underset{\sim}{T}^m \cap {}^{g(\ell)}2 = t$ but it also forces that $\underset{\sim}{T}^m$ satisfies the condition $(*)_\ell$ from Definition 4.2, hence in fact it forces that t satisfies it (as it gives all the relevant information) hence T^m_η satisfies it. Similarly for $T^m_{n,\eta}$. Concerning clause (b) there is q satisfying $p^{[\eta]} \leq_{pr} q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ forcing $\underset{\sim}{T}^m_\eta \cap {}^\ell 2 = t_m, T^m_n \cap {}^\ell 2 = t_{m,n}$

so by $(*)_2$, if $n \geq \ell$ they are equal. As any two (even finitely many) pure extensions of $p^{[\eta]}$ are compatible, we have $T^m_\eta \cap {}^\ell 2 = t_m, T^m_{n,\eta} \cap {}^\ell 2 = t_{m,n} = t_n$. This is clearly enough.]

Hence by assumption (d) we have for $u \subseteq m^*$ and $\eta \in p$

$$(*)^{u,n}_6 \quad \mathbf{r} \in \bigcap_{m \in u} \lim(T^m_\eta) \text{ implies that } (\exists^\infty n)(\mathbf{r} \in \bigcap_{m \in u} \lim T^m_{n,\eta}) \text{ and moreover } (\forall A \in ([\omega]^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}})(\exists^\infty n \in A)[\mathbf{r} \in \bigcap_{m \in u} \lim(T^m_{\eta,n})].$$

But if $\mathbf{r} \notin \lim(T^m_\eta)$ then for some $k^* < \omega, \mathbf{r} \restriction k^* \in T^m_\eta$ hence $n^* < n < \omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{r} \restriction k^* \in T^m_{n,\eta}$ so by $(*)_5(b)$ we have

$(*)^{m,\eta}_7$ if $\mathbf{r} \notin \lim(T^m_\eta)$ then $(\exists^{<\aleph_0} n)[\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_{n,\eta})]$.

By the assumption on $D_{1,\eta}$ we have

$(*)_8(i)$ $\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_\eta)$ iff $\mathbf{r} \in \lim_{D_\eta} \langle T^m_{\eta\hat{}\langle k \rangle} : k < \omega \rangle$

(ii) $\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_{n,\eta})$ iff $\mathbf{r} \in \lim_{D_\eta} \langle T^m_{n,\eta\hat{}\langle k \rangle} : k < \omega \rangle$.

By $(*)_6 + (*)_7$ applied to $\eta = \text{tr}(p)$, we can find $n(*) > n(**)$, see $(*)_1$, such that $(\forall m < m^*)[\mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_{\text{tr}(p)}) \equiv \mathbf{r} \in \lim(T^m_{n(*),\text{tr}(p)})]$. Next let

$$q =: \{\nu \in p : \text{if } \ell g(tr(p)) \leq \ell \leq \ell g(\nu) \text{ and } m < m^* \text{ then } (\mathbf{r} \in T^m_{\nu \restriction \ell}) \equiv (\text{ and } \mathbf{r} \in T^m_{n(*),\nu \restriction \ell})\}.$$

Now $p \leq_{\text{pr}} q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ by $(*)_8$. Lastly, let $q^* =: \{\nu \in q : \text{if } \text{tr}(p) \trianglelefteq \nu, \underline{\text{then}}\ \nu \in q_{\nu \restriction \ell}\}$.

Does $q^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}}$ "$\mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m) \equiv \mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m_{n(*)})$"? if not, then for some q^{**} we have $q^* \leq q^{**}$ and $q^{**} \Vdash_{Q_{\bar{D}_1}}$ "$\mathbf{r} \in \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m) \equiv r \notin \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m_{n(*)})$" and moreover, for some k we have $q^{**} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}}$ "$\mathbf{r} \restriction k \in \underset{\sim}{T}^m \equiv \mathbf{r} \restriction k \notin \lim(\underset{\sim}{T}^m_{n(*)})$". But $q^{**}, q_{\text{tr}(q^{**}),k}, q_{n(*),\text{tr}(q^{**}),k}$ are compatible having the same trunk, so let q' be a common upper bound with $\text{tr}(q') = \text{tr}(q^{**})$ and we get a contradiction. $\square_{5.6}$

5.7 Claim. *1) Assume*

(a) $\bar{D} \in \mathbf{IUF}$

(b) $\bar{D} \in N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$

(c) $\rho \in {}^\omega 2 \backslash N$

(d) $\underset{\sim}{\eta} = \underset{\sim}{\eta}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$.

Then

(α) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "*if* $f \in N[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}]$ *and* $f \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} {}^{\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)}2$ *then* $(\forall^* n)(\neg f(n) \lhd \rho)$", *moreover*

(β) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "*if* $f \in N[G_{\mathbb{Q}_D}], f$ *a function with domain* $\omega, f(n) \subseteq {}^{\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)}2$ *and* $|f(n)| < \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n-1)$ *when* $n \geq 0$, *then* $(\forall^* n)(\rho \restriction \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) \notin f(n))$ *stipulating* $\underset{\sim}{\eta}(-1) = 1$.

5.8 Remark. 1) Instead $\bar{D} \in N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ it is enough to have assumptions like [Sh 630].
2) This may be relevant to trying to get universes satisfying the Borel conjecture.

Proof. Let $\underset{\sim}{f} \in N$ be such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}$ is a function with domain ω such that $|f(n)| \leq \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n-1)$ and $\emptyset \neq \underset{\sim}{f}(n) \subseteq 2^{\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)}$" and we shall prove that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}} \text{"}\rho \restriction \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) \notin f(n) \text{ for every } n < \omega \text{ large enough".}$$

This clearly suffices. For each $n > 0$ and $\nu \in {}^{n+1}\omega$ we can find $q_\nu \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ and ρ^m_ν for $m < \nu(n-1)$, such that $\text{tr}(q_\nu) = \nu$ and $q_\nu \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}(n) = \{\rho^m_\nu : m < \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n-1)\}$". Note that $q_\nu \Vdash$ "$k < \ell g(\nu) \Rightarrow \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n) = \nu(k)$ in particular for $k = n-1$" and $\Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}(n) \subseteq 2^{\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)}, 1 \leq |f(n)| \leq \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n-1))$" hence $\rho^\ell_\nu \in {}^{\nu(n)}2$. As $\underset{\sim}{f} \in N$ without loss of generality $\langle (q_\nu, \rho^m_\nu) : m < \nu(n-1), n < \ell g(\nu)$ and $\nu \in {}^{n+1}\omega, n < \omega$ belongs to N. Now for each $\nu \in {}^{\omega >}\omega, m < \nu(\ell g(\nu) - 1) < k$ clearly $\rho^m_{\nu\char`^<k>} \in {}^k2$, so for every $\ell < \omega$ for some $\rho^m_{\nu,\ell} \in {}^\ell 2$ we have $\{k < \omega : \rho^m_{\nu\char`^<k>} \restriction \ell = \rho^m_{\nu,\ell}$ and $k > \ell\}$ belongs to D_ν, and clearly $\rho^m_{\nu,\ell} \lhd \rho^m_{\nu,\ell+1}$ and let $\rho^m_{\nu,*} = \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\omega} \rho^m_{\nu,\ell}$ so $\rho^m_{\nu,*} \in N \cap {}^\omega 2$ hence $\rho^m_\nu \neq \rho$ so for some $\ell(\nu, m) < \omega$ we have $\rho^m_\nu \restriction \ell(\nu, m) \neq \rho \restriction \ell(\nu, m)$ hence $\{k : (\exists m)\rho^m_{\nu\char`^<k>} \lhd \rho\} = \emptyset \bmod D$.

Let $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} q = \{\nu : & \nu \trianglelefteq tr(p) \text{ or } tr(p) \lhd \nu \in p \text{ and if } k \in [\ell g(tr(p)), \ell g(\nu)) \\ & \text{and } m < \nu(k-1) \text{ then } \neg\rho^m_{\nu\restriction(k+1)} \lhd \rho)\} \end{aligned}$$

is a condition above p forcing $\{n : \underset{\sim}{f}(n) \lhd \rho\}$ is bounded by $\ell g(tr(p))$, so we are done.

$\square_{5.7}$

5.9 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\bar{D} = \mathbf{IUF}$

(b) *D is a non principal ultrafilter on ω*

(c) *for some n^*, if $(*)$ below holds, <u>then</u> $D \nsubseteq \cup\{D'_{\nu,m} : \nu \in {}^{\omega>}\omega \backslash {}^{n^*\geq}\omega$ and $m < \nu(\ell g(\nu) - 1)\}$*

   $(*)$ *for $\nu \in {}^{\omega>}\omega \backslash {}^{n^*\geq}\omega$ we have $D'_{\nu,m} \leq_{RK} D_\nu$ by a finite to one function, and, of course $D'_{\nu,m}$ a non principal ultrafilter on ω.*

<u>Then</u> in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ we have:

$(*)$ *if $w_n \subseteq [\underset{\sim}{\eta}(n), \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n+1)), |w_n| \leq \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)$, <u>then</u> $\cup\{w_n : n < \omega\}$ is disjoint to some member of D.*

Remark. This is relevant to trying to get no Q-point.

Proof. Without loss of generality $n^* = 0$ (just fix $\underset{\sim}{\eta} \restriction n^*$) and assume $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\bar{w}} = \langle \underset{\sim}{w}_n : n < \omega\rangle, \underset{\sim}{w}_n \subseteq \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n+1), |w_n| \leq \underset{\sim}{\eta}(n)$". Without loss of generality $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ "$w_n \neq \emptyset$". For $\nu \in {}^{n+2}\omega$ let $q_\nu \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ be such that $\mathrm{tr}(q_\nu) = \nu$ and $q_\nu \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{w}_n = \{t^m_\nu : m < \nu(n)\}$". For $m < \nu(\ell g(\nu) - 1)$, let $D'_{\nu,m} = \{A \subseteq \omega : \{k : t^m_{\nu^n \char`\^ <k>} \in A\} \in D_\nu\}$; clearly $D'_{\nu,m}$ is a non principal ultrafilter on $\omega$ which is $\leq_{RK} D_\nu$ as $\nu(\ell g(\nu) - 1) < t^m_{\nu \char`\^ <k>} < k$.
The rest should be clear.. $\square_{5.9}$

Results here are used in the next section; formally we have to specialize them as $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is just j random reals forcing.

For preservation, including cardinals not collapsed we use §2 or §3 (really more explicit version).

5.10 Hypothesis.

(a) $\mathbf{V} \models CH$

(b) $\mathscr{F}^*$ is the standard trunk controller

(c) $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ is a family whose elements we denote by $\bar{R}$ and $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R})$ is a c.c.c. forcing notion possibly with extra structure

(d) $<_{\mathfrak{K}(0)}$ is a partial order on $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ such that $\bar{R}' \leq_{\mathfrak{K}(0)} \bar{R}'' \Rightarrow \mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}') \lessdot \mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}'')$; recall that "$\kappa$-closed" means every increasing sequence of length $< \kappa$ has an upper bound.

We say $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ is θ-exactly closed if for $\langle \bar{R}^\ell : i < \theta \rangle, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}(0)}$-increasing there is $\bar{R}, i < \theta \Rightarrow \bar{R}^i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}(0)} \bar{R}$ and $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}) = \bigcup\limits_{i<\theta} \mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}_i)$.

5.11 Definition. 1) For an ordinal $\alpha > 0$ (assuming $\mathscr{F}^*$ is based on some $\alpha^* \geq \alpha$) let $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ be the family of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}^*$-iteration of length α
- (b) $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is a c.c.c. forcing notion from $\mathfrak{K}(0)$, i.e. it is $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}), \bar{R} \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$, in principle $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R})$ may not determine $\bar{R}$ uniquely but we shall ignore this [neater is to demand that it satisfies a strong version but not really necessarily]
- (c) if $0 < \beta < \alpha$ then $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta$ is $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_{\underset{\sim}{\bar{D}}_\beta}$ where $\Vdash_{P_\beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\bar{D}}_\beta \in \mathbf{IUF}$" (on $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_{\bar{D}}$ see 5.2, on $\mathbf{IUF}$, see 5.1).

2) Let $\mathfrak{K} = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha} \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{<\alpha} = \cup\{\mathfrak{K}_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\}$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{\leq\alpha} = \mathfrak{K}_{<\alpha+1}$.
We use $\mathbb{P}_\alpha = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{Q} \restriction \alpha)$, so e.g. $\mathbb{P}^1_\alpha = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \restriction \beta)$.

5.12 Definition. 1) For $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}$ let $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$ if:

- (a) $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \leq \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$
- (b) for $\beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1)$ we have $\mathbb{P}_{1,\beta} \lessdot \mathbb{P}_{2,\beta}$, i.e. $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \restriction \beta) \lessdot \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \restriction \beta)$
- (c) for $\beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1), \beta \neq 0$ and $\eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \restriction \beta}$ "$\underset{\sim}{D}_{1,\beta,\eta} \subseteq \underset{\sim}{D}_{2,\beta,\eta}$"
- (d) if $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) = \beta < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$ then $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \restriction \beta) \lessdot \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \restriction \beta)$.

5.13 Claim. *Assume $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$ are from $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha$.*
1) If α is not a limit ordinal then

$$Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \lessdot Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2).$$

2) If α is a limit ordinal, $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}, \beta < \alpha, \underset{\sim}{\nu}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_{2,\beta}$-name such that, for every $\gamma \in [\beta, \alpha)$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{2,\gamma}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}$ is $\mathbf{T}_{\mathscr{G}}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{1,\gamma}}$" and $\mathbb{P}_{1,\alpha} = Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \lessdot \mathbb{P}_{2,\alpha} = Lim(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$, then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{2,\alpha}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}$ is $\mathbf{T}_{\mathscr{G}}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{1,\alpha}}$".

Proof. 1) By 1.12.
2) By diagonalizing. $\square_{5.13}$

The following is intended to help mainly in chain conditions, but at present not used.

5.14 Claim. *Let* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$,
1) We define $cr(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ *as the family of objects* $\mathfrak{p}$ *consisting of:*

(a) $w[\mathfrak{p}] \in [\alpha]^{\le \aleph_0}$ *and let* $\gamma(\mathfrak{p}) = \cup\{\beta + 1 : \beta \in w(\mathfrak{p})\}$

(b) $val(\mathfrak{p}) \in \mathscr{F}$, $Dom(p) = w[\mathfrak{p}]$

(c) *for* $\beta \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cup \{\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]\} \backslash \{0\}$, *a countable subset* $\mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *of* $\{q : q \in \mathbb{P}_\beta, Dom(q) = w(\mathfrak{p}) \cap \beta$ *and* $\mathscr{F} \models \mathrm{val}(\mathfrak{p}) \le^{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathrm{apr}} val(q)\}$, *so the minimal such* β *we get a subset of* $\mathbb{Q}_0$

(d) *for* $\beta \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cup \{\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]\}$, *a countable family* $\tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *of* $\mathbb{P}_\beta$*-names* $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ *of a member of* {*true,false*} *and for each* $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *we have a set* $\mathscr{I}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}[\mathfrak{p}] \subseteq \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *such that* $q \in \mathscr{I}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}[\mathfrak{p}] \Rightarrow q$ *forces a value to* $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$

(e) *for* $\beta \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cup \{\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]\}$ *and* $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *the set* $\mathscr{I}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}[\mathfrak{p}]$ *is a predense subset of* $\{q \in \mathbb{P}_\beta : val(q) \in \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]\}$

(f) *if* $\beta \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cup \{\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]\} \backslash \{0\}$ *and* $q \in \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *and* $\gamma \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cap \beta$ *and* $\eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega$ *then each "truth value*($\eta \in q(\gamma)$)*" belongs to* $\tau_\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]$. *[So* $\mathfrak{p}$ *involves a countable subset of* $\mathbb{Q}_0$.*]*

2) We say $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2$ *(which are in* $cr(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$*, or more generally* $\mathfrak{p}_\ell \in cr(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\ell)$ *with the obvious changes) are strongly isomorphic as witnessed by the function* h *if:*

(a) $w[\mathfrak{p}_1] = w[\mathfrak{p}_2]$

(b) $h \restriction \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *is a 1-to-1 mapping from* $\mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *onto* $\mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_2]$

(c) $h \restriction \tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ *is a one-to-one mapping from* $\tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *onto* $\tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_2]$

(d) *for* $q \in \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *we have* $val(h(q)) = val(q)$

(e) *if* $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *then* h *maps* $\mathscr{I}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *onto* $\mathscr{I}_{h(\underset{\sim}{\tau})}[\mathfrak{p}_2]$ *that is* $\mathscr{I}_{h(\underset{\sim}{\tau})}[\mathfrak{p}_2] = \{h(q) : q \in \mathscr{I}_{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}[\mathfrak{p}_1]\}$

(f) *if* $\mathbf{t}$ *is a truth value,* $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in \tau_\beta[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *and* $q \in \mathscr{I}_\tau[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *and* $q \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} = \mathbf{t}$" *then* $h(q) \Vdash$ "$h(\underset{\sim}{\tau}) = \mathbf{t}$".

3) We omit the "strongly" if we replace in part (2) clause (a) by:

(a)′ h *is an order preserving map from* $w[\mathfrak{p}_1]$ *onto* $w[\mathfrak{p}_2]$ *and such that* $0 \in [\mathfrak{p}_1] \Leftrightarrow 0 \in w[\mathfrak{p}_2]$.

5.15 Definition. 1) By induction on $\alpha \geq 1$ we define $\mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ as the family of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ such that if $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$, then for every $\mathfrak{p}_2 \in \text{ cr}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$ there is $\mathfrak{p}_1 \in \text{cr}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1)$, strongly isomorphic to $\mathfrak{p}_2$ say as witnessed by the identity function such that

- $(*)$ if $\beta \in w[\mathfrak{p}] \cup \{\gamma[\mathfrak{p}]\} \backslash \{0\}$ is minimal and $r_1 \in \mathscr{P}_\beta[\mathfrak{p}]$ and $r_2 = h(r_1)$ then r_2, r_1 are compatible in $\mathbb{Q}_0$ whenever $r_1 \leq r \in \mathbb{Q}_0$.

2) Let $\mathfrak{K}^+ = \bigcup\limits_\alpha \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$.

5.16 Remark. Alternatively $\mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ is the family of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \in \mathfrak{K}^\pm_\alpha = \{\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha : (\forall \beta)(1 \leq \beta < \alpha \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\beta)\}$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq^*_0 \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}^\pm_\alpha \Rightarrow \text{ Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \lessdot \text{ Lim}_F(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$.

5.17 Observation: 1) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \mathbb{Q}_2$ are both from $\mathfrak{K}_{\alpha+1}$ then $\text{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \lessdot \text{ Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$.

2) $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ is a partial order on $\mathfrak{K}$.
3) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$ then $\text{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1) \lessdot \text{ Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2)$.
4) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{1,0} = \mathbb{Q}_{2,0}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ then $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ (in fact $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2 = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1$).
5) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ for $i < \delta$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$-increasing, $\delta < \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ is κ-closed then there is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ such that $i < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.
6) If in (5) if $K(0)$ is $\text{cf}(\delta)$-exactly closed, $\text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$, then we can add $\text{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = \bigcup\limits_{i<\delta} \text{ Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i)$.
7) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha, (\forall \beta < \kappa)(|\beta|^{\aleph_0} < \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa))$ and $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ is κ-closed, each member of $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha(0)$ is of cardinality $< \kappa, \alpha < \kappa, \aleph_0 < \theta = \text{ cf}(\theta) < \kappa, \mathfrak{K}(0)$ is exactly θ-closed and $|\mathscr{F}| < \kappa$ then there is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ such that $\mathbb{Q} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'$ (we can normally bound the cardinality of $\text{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}')$.

Proof. By induction on α, quite straightforward.

Anyhow we do not use this. $\square_{5.17}$

§6

On a relative of Borel conjecture with large $\mathfrak{b}$

6.1 Hypothesis.

- (a) $\mathbf{V} \models CH$
- (b) $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda, (\forall \alpha < \lambda)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda), S \subseteq \lambda$ is stationary, $(\forall \delta \in S)(\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0)$
- (c) $\mathscr{F}$ is a rich enough standard trunk controller (e.g. full).

We now specify the $\mathfrak{K}$ from §5.

6.2 Definition. 1) Let $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ be the family of $\{\mathrm{Random}_A : A \subseteq \lambda\}$ where $d(A) = \{\omega\alpha + n : \alpha \in A, n < \omega\}$ and Random_A is the family of Borel subsets of ${}^{d(A)}2$ of positive Lebesgue measure. Let $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\alpha = \cup\{f : f$ a finite function from $[\omega\alpha, \omega\alpha + \omega)$ to $\{0,1\}$ such that $[f] = \{g \in {}^A 2 : f \subseteq g\}$ belongs to the generic$\}$. Let $A(\mathbb{Q}) = A$ if $\mathbb{Q} =$ Random_A. Let $\mathrm{Random}_A \le_{\mathfrak{K}(0)}$ Random_B if $A \subseteq B$ hence $\mathrm{Random}_A \lessdot \mathrm{Random}_B$. (So $\le_{pr}$ will be just equality, $\le_{apr}$ will be the usual order).
2) For $\alpha \ge 1$, let $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ be defined as in 5.11.
3) We define for any ordinal α and $\ell < 2$ the class $\mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha} \subseteq \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ as the class of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an $\mathscr{F}$-iteration
- (b) $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = \alpha$
- (c) $\mathbb{Q}_0 \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$ and $A[\mathbb{Q}_0] \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$ if $\alpha < \lambda$ & $\ell = 0$ and $A[\mathbb{Q}_0] = \lambda$ if $\ell = 1$
- (d) if $0 < \beta < \alpha$ then $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_\beta = \mathbb{Q}(\bar{\underset{\sim}{D}}_\beta)$ where $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ "$\bar{\underset{\sim}{D}}_\beta = \langle \underset{\sim}{D}_{\beta,\eta} : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega \rangle \in$ **IUF**"
- (e) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \gamma \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\gamma$ for every $\gamma < \alpha$ where $\mathfrak{K}^+_\gamma$ is defined in 5.15 for our particular case.

3A) If we omit ℓ, we mean $\ell = 0$ when $\alpha < \lambda$ and we mean $\ell = 1$ when $\alpha \ge \lambda$. We let $\mathfrak{K}'_\ell = \cup\{\mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha} : \alpha$ an ordinal$\}$ and $\mathfrak{K}' = \cup\{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha : \alpha$ an ordinal$\}$.
4) For $\ell = 0, 1$, we define a partial order $\le_{\mathfrak{K}'_\ell}$ on $\mathfrak{K}'_\ell$ by:
$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \le_{\mathfrak{K}'_\ell} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ iff $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \le_{\mathfrak{K}_\ell} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ and $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1) < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2) \Rightarrow$ [there is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \in \mathfrak{K}^+_{\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}')}$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \le_{\mathfrak{K}_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \le_{\mathfrak{K}_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$] and

- $(*)$ if γ is the minimal member of $A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2) \backslash A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1)$ then (so if $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ this holds vacuously)
  $\Vdash_{\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2)}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\gamma$ is $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1)}$" (see 4.5(1), (3)).

4A) We similarly define the partial order $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}'}$ on $\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ and let $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha}} = \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\ell} \restriction \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$.
5) Let $\mathfrak{K}''_\alpha$ be the family of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ such that:

- (e) $A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = \lambda$ if $\alpha \geq \lambda, A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$ if $\alpha < \lambda$
- (f) if $\alpha \geq \lambda, \beta \in (0,\alpha), \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\omega$ and in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ letting $D_{\beta,\eta}$ be the interpretation of the $\mathbb{P}_\beta$-name $\underset{\sim}{D}_{\beta,\eta}$, we have: if $g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$ and $T, T_n \in \mathbf{T}_g^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_\beta]}, T = \lim\langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$, then for a club of $j \in S$, we have $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\alpha \in \lim(T) \Rightarrow (\exists^\infty n)\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\alpha \in \lim(T_n)$.

6.3 Claim. *1) The two place relations $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_{1,\alpha}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha}$ are partial orders.*
2) The two place relation $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_0}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_1}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'}$ are partial orders.
3) Assume

- (a) *δ is a limit ordinal*
- (b) *$\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1_1, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2_2 \in \mathfrak{K}_{0,\delta}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_{0,\delta}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$*
- (c) *$\mathbb{P}^1_\delta = Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1_\delta) \lessdot \mathbb{P}^2_\delta = Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2_\delta)$*
- (d) *$\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \restriction \alpha \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2 \restriction \alpha$.*

Then $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 <_{\mathfrak{K}'_\ell} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$.
4) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_0} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ and $\ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1) = \alpha + 1 < \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2)$ then $Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^1) \lessdot Lim_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^2 \restriction \alpha)$.

Proof. 1) Easy.
2) Easy.
3) By 5.13.
4) By 5.6(2). $\square_{6.3}$

6.4 Observation: 1) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}''_{1,\beta}$ and $\lambda \leq \beta$, then in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}$ we have: if $\mathscr{B}^*$ is a Borel subset of Lebesque measure $1, \mathscr{B}^* = \bigcup\limits_n \lim(T_n), \{T_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathbf{T}_g, g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$ then for a club of $j \in S$ we have $\mathrm{cf}(j) > \aleph_0 \Rightarrow \underset{\sim}{\nu}_j \in \mathscr{B}^*$.
2) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'$ and $\beta \leq \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, then the $\mathscr{F}$-forcing notion $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ is essentially $\mathscr{F}$-psc and has 2-pure decidability over $\mathbb{Q}_0$.
3) Moreover, (in (2)) $\mathbb{Q}$ is semi-simple, hence if $p \in \mathbb{P}_\beta, p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in {}^\omega\mathrm{Ord}$" then for some q we have $p \leq_{\mathrm{pr}} q$ and for each $n, \mathscr{I}_n = \{r : q \leq_{\mathrm{apr}} r$ or just $\mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}(q) \leq_{\mathrm{apr}} \mathrm{val}^{\mathbb{P}_\beta}(r)$ and r forces a value to $\underset{\sim}{\tau}(n)\}$ is predense above q or even is $\{q' : \mathrm{val}(q) \leq \mathrm{val}(q')\}$.

Proof. 1) Apply clause (e) of Definition 6.2 to $\mathscr{B}, \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega \rangle$.
2), 3) By previous theorems. $\square_{6.4}$

6.5 Claim. *0)* $\mathfrak{K}'_0 \neq \emptyset$.
1) If $\alpha_* \leq \alpha < \lambda, \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'_{\alpha_*}, j \in \lambda \backslash A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, *then there is* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \in \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ *such that* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\gamma$ *and* $A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}') \supseteq A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \cup \{j\}$.
2) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta \in \mathfrak{K}'_{\leq \alpha}$ *for* $\zeta < \delta$ *and* $\varepsilon < \zeta < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\varepsilon \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta$ *and* ($cf(\delta) > \aleph_0 \vee \alpha < \lambda$), *then for some* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\delta \in \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ *we have* $\zeta < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\delta$.
3) For $\alpha < \lambda$ *and* $A \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$ *there is* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ *with* $A(\bar{Q}) \supseteq A$.
4) Part (2) holds for $\mathfrak{K}''_\alpha$, *too, if* $cf(\delta) > \aleph_0$.

Remark. Note that we have to prove that "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\gamma$ is $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous" is preserved.

Proof. We prove by induction on α (all parts simultaneously).
0) Trivial
1) We choose $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\beta$ for $\beta \in [1, \alpha]$ by induction on β such that:

- (i) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\beta \in \mathfrak{K}'_\beta$
- (ii) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\beta$
- (iii) $\gamma < \beta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\gamma = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\beta \restriction \alpha$
- (iv) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\beta \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\beta$.

Case 1: $\beta = 1$.
We choose $\mathbb{Q}^\beta_0 =$ Random$_{A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \cup \{j\}}$.

Case 2: $\beta = \beta_* + 1 > 1$.
By 5.6(1) + (2) we can choose $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_\beta \in \mathfrak{K}_\beta$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_\beta \restriction \beta_* = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\beta_*}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta \leq_{\mathfrak{K}_\beta} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'$. But maybe $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_\beta \notin \mathfrak{K}^+_\beta$. So we try to choose by induction on $i < \lambda, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,i}$ such that:

- (i) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,i} \restriction \beta_* \in \mathfrak{K}^+_{\beta_*}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,0} = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_\beta$
- (ii) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,i}$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}_\beta}$-increasing
- (iii) for each $i, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,i+1}$ exemplifying $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\beta,i} \notin \mathfrak{K}^+_\beta$.

For $i = 0$ no problem, for i limit use the part (2) for β_* by the induction hypothesis. For i successor if we cannot continue, we have succeeded. Having carried the induction by the L.S.-argument (as $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda =$ cf(λ)) we can find

$\delta < \lambda$, $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$ such that every "strong isomorphic type" occurs, contradicting (iii).

Case 3: β limit.

Mostly also easy and similar to part (2) but we need to preserve the $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous.

2) We choose $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\delta,\beta}$ by induction on $\beta \in [1,\alpha]$ such that:

(i) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\delta,\beta} \in \mathfrak{K}'_\beta$

(ii) $\gamma < \beta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\delta,\beta} \restriction \gamma \le_{\mathfrak{K}'_\gamma} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\delta,\gamma}$

(iii) $\zeta < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\zeta} \restriction \beta \le_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\delta,\beta}$.

Case 1: $\beta = 1$.

Let $\mathbb{Q}_0^{\delta,\beta} = \text{Random}_{\cup\{A(\bar{Q}^\zeta):\zeta<\delta\}}$.

Case 2: $\beta = \gamma + 1$.

Easy.

Case 3: β limit.

Take limit. [We should be careful about $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous].

2), 3) should be clear. $\square_{6.5}$

6.6 Conclusion: 1) For any ordinal $\alpha < \lambda$ we can find $\langle \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta : \zeta \le \lambda \rangle$ such that

(a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta \in \mathfrak{K}''_\alpha$

(b) $\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\varepsilon \le_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta$

(c) $A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta) \supseteq \zeta$ and $\zeta < \lambda \Rightarrow |A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta)| < \lambda$

(d) if $\zeta < \lambda$ is a limit ordinal of uncountable cofinality then $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta) = \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} \mathrm{Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\varepsilon)$.

2) Let $\mathbb{P}$ be $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\lambda)$. Then

(a) $\mathbb{P}$ is a proper forcing notion of cardinality λ satisfying the $\aleph_2$-c.c.c. (so cardinal arithmetic in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ should be clear)

(b) if $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) > \aleph_0$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{d}$"

(c) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "there is a set $\{\nu_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\} \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ which is not in the $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-ideal"

(d) the continuum in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ is λ.

3) For limit $\zeta < \lambda$ of uncountable cofinality, letting $\mathbb{P}_\zeta = \text{ Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\zeta)$, we have

(a) $\mathbb{P}_\zeta$ is a proper forcing notion of cardinality $(|\alpha| + |\zeta|)^{\aleph_0}$ satisfying the $\aleph_2$-c.c.c.

(b) if $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \aleph_0$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathfrak{b} = \text{ cf}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{d}$"

(c) if $A \subseteq \zeta = \sup(A)$ then
$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "the set $\{\nu_i : i \in A\}$ is not in the $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-ideal

(d) the continuum in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ is $((|\alpha| + |\zeta|)^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$.

Discussion: 1) Is there a Cohen in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ over $\mathbf{V}$? By the way we construct in general, yes, as possibly $\mathbb{P}^0_2 \lessdot \mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}^2_0$ is $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}^0_1}$ which may add Cohen. To replace $\langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ by say a Sierpinski set in $\mathbf{V}$ we do not know.
2) Similarly, the Borel conjecture may fail.

Proof of 6.6. : Easy by quoting.

6.7 Claim. *1) There is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}''_{\lambda^+}$.*
2) If $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}''_\alpha, \alpha \geq \lambda$ and $\mathbb{P} = $ Lim$(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ then

(a) *$\mathbb{P}$ is a proper forcing notion of cardinality $|\alpha|^{\aleph_0}$ satisfying the $\aleph_2$-c.c.c.*

(b) *if cf$(\alpha) \geq \aleph_0$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathfrak{b} = $ cf$(\alpha) = \mathfrak{d}$"*

(c) *$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\{\underset{\sim}{\nu}_i : i < \lambda\}$ is not in the $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-null ideal".*

Proof. 1) Using $\diamondsuit_\lambda$, as in [Sh:f, IV].
2) Like 6.6. $\square_{6.7}$

§7 Continuing [Sh 592]

7.1 Context: As in §6.

At present we can deal with this for "$\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}_0}$-continuous" instead Random. To do it fully we need to make the ultrafilter $\underset{\sim}{D}_{\alpha,\eta}$ Ramsey but we do not know to guarantee this.

7.2 Theorem. *Assume*

$(*)(i)$ $\kappa \le \theta < \mu < \lambda = \lambda^{<\mu} = 2^\kappa$

(ii) κ *regular and* $(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \kappa)$

(iii) $\theta =$ *cf*(θ) *and* $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \mu)$

(iv) μ *is a limit cardinal*

(v) $\mathscr{G} = \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$.

Then for some forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ *we have:*

(α) $\mathbb{P}$ *is an* $\aleph_2$*-c.c. proper forcing notion of cardinality* λ

(β) *in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ *we have cov(*$\mathscr{G}$*-continuous ideal* $=$ *Null*$_{\mathscr{G}}$*)* $= \mu$

(γ) *in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ *we have* $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \theta$.

7.3 Remark. 1) We rely on [Sh 592], if instead we rely on [Sh 619], then we can weaken the assumptions on the cardinals.
2) By observation in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ we have: the covering by closed null sets number is also μ so can be $\aleph_\omega$, i.e. "$\mathfrak{d} < \mu$".

Proof of 7.2. Let $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ be the family of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}^3$ from Definition 2.11 of [Sh 592] of length $< \lambda$ ordered naturally: $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \le \bar{\mathbb{Q}}''$ iff $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}'' \restriction \ell g(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}')$, of course, $\mathbb{Q}$ stands for the forcing $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, 5.10(d). Clearly $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is FS iteration, this fixes the choice in 5.10. Sometimes we replace the ordinal $< \lambda$ by a set of ordinals, with obvious meaning. To avoid confusion we use $\bar{R}$ for such iterations and if $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is such a forcing, i.e. $\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R})$ we let $\bar{R} = \bar{R}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\langle \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\zeta : \zeta < \ell g(\bar{R})\rangle$ for the generic in 5.11 - 5.14. Clearly $\mathfrak{K}(0)$ is cf(λ)-closed, but as $\lambda = \lambda^{<\mu}$ necessarily cf$(\lambda) > \mu > \theta$. For $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ let $\langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_i[\bar{\mathbb{Q}}] : 0 < i < \alpha\rangle$ denotes the sequence of generic reals, $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_i[\bar{\mathbb{Q}}]$ for $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_i$. So we can find $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_0 \in \mathfrak{K}'_\theta$. Now by induction on $\zeta < \lambda$ we define $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta$ such that:

(a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\theta \cap \mathfrak{R}'_\theta$

(b) $\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\varepsilon \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta$ (hence $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\varepsilon) \lessdot \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta)$)

(*c*) letting $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta} \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$ be such that $\mathbb{Q}_{\zeta,0} = \mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta})$ we have $\ell g(\bar{R}_\zeta) = \ell g(\bar{R}_0) + \xi_\zeta$

(*d*) if

  (*i*) $\varepsilon < \lambda, \theta \le \chi = \chi^{\aleph_0} < \mu$

  (*ii*) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\theta, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}' \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\varepsilon$

  (*iii*) $A \subseteq \ell g(\bar{R}_{Q_{\varepsilon,0}})$ is of cardinality $\le \chi$

  then for some $\zeta \in [\varepsilon, \lambda)$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\zeta+1})}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_{\ell g(\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\zeta,0}})}$, the partial random real of the $\ell g(\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\zeta,0}})$-iterand of the iteration $\mathbb{Q}_{\zeta,0} \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$ is $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}[\langle \underset{\sim}{\eta}_\zeta : \zeta \in A\rangle \hat{} \langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_i : i < \theta\rangle]$".

There is no problem for $\zeta = 0$ and ζ limit. For $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1$, let $\gamma = \ell g(\bar{R}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\varepsilon,0}}), \bar{R} = \bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\varepsilon,0}}$. By bookkeeping we are given $\xi \le \varepsilon$ and $A_\varepsilon \subseteq \ell g(\bar{R}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\xi,0}})$ of cardinality $\le \chi$. By the Lowenheim-Skolem argument, choose $A^*_\varepsilon \subseteq \gamma$ of cardinality $\le \chi$ including A_ε, closed enough (in particular, as required in [Sh 592], see 2.16 (1),(2) and $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\varepsilon,0}} \restriction A^*_\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$) and there is $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\varepsilon \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\varepsilon$ such that $\bar{R}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\varepsilon,0}} = \bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\varepsilon,0}} \restriction A^*_\varepsilon$. By the bookkeeping we can ensure every A will appear. Let $\underset{\sim}{R}_\gamma = \mathrm{Random}^{\mathbf{V}[\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\beta:\beta\in A^*_\varepsilon]}$ and let $\bar{R}'_\varepsilon$ be $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\varepsilon,0}}$ when we add $\underset{\sim}{R}_\gamma$, i.e. $\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\varepsilon,0}} \le_{\mathfrak{K}} \ell g(\bar{R}''_\varepsilon) = \ell g(\bar{R}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'_{\varepsilon,0}}) \cup \{\gamma\}$ (abusing notion) $(R''_\varepsilon)_\gamma = R_\gamma$ ($\bar{R}''_\varepsilon$ exists by [Sh 592]). By 5.14 we can find $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'' \in \mathfrak{K}^+ \cap K'_\theta$ and $R''_\varepsilon <_{\mathfrak{K}(0)} \mathbb{Q}''_0$ which satisfies $\Vdash_{\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}'')}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\gamma$ is random over $\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{Lim}(\bar{R}\restriction A)}$".

By renaming, without loss of generality $A(\mathbb{Q}''_0) \cap A(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^\varepsilon) = B^*_\varepsilon$.

Now we can define $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta$ by amalgamation, i.e. 7.4 below. Let $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\lambda$ by $\bigcup\limits_{\zeta<\lambda} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\lambda) = \bigcup\limits_{\zeta<\lambda} \mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\zeta)$. It is as required: $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \theta$" easily, and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "cov(null) $\ge \mu$" by clause (d) and the bookkeeping concerning the A_ε's. Lastly $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "cov(null) $\le \mu$" because $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\lambda,0}}$ "cov(null) $\le \mu$" by [Sh 592] and properties of $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{\lambda,\theta})/\mathbb{Q}_{\lambda,0}$. $\square_{7.2}$

7.4 Claim. *Assume*

(*a*) $\mathbb{Q}_{\ell,0} \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$ *for* $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ *and* $\mathbb{Q}_{0,0} \lessdot \mathbb{Q}_{\ell,0} \lessdot \mathbb{Q}_{3,0}$ *moreover* $\mathbb{Q}_{3,0} = \mathbb{Q}_{1,0} *_{\mathbb{Q}_{0,0}} \mathbb{Q}_{2,1}$

(*b*) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ *for* $\ell = 0, 1, 2$

(*c*) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_0 \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1$ *and* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_0 \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$.

Then we can find $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_3 \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ such that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_3$ for $\ell < 3$.

Remark. 1) How do we get such $\mathbb{Q}_{\ell,0} \in \mathfrak{K}(0)$? By [Sh 592, Lemma 2.16].
2) We can replace $\mathbb{Q}_{3,0}$ by $\bar{Q}_{3,\alpha}$ as the proof.

Proof. We choose $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_3 \restriction \beta$ by induction on $\beta \in [1,\alpha]$, for $\beta = 1$ there is nothing to do. For β limit just use $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell \restriction \beta \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$. For $\beta = \gamma + 1$ use 7.5 below; we could have demanded something on how $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_0 \le_{\mathfrak{K}'} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$ (i.e. choosing $\bar{A}_\varepsilon$ in the proof of 7.2 but not needed).

7.5 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) Q_ℓ *is a forcing notion for* $\ell \le 3$
- (b) $Q_0 \lessdot Q_\ell \lessdot Q_3$
- (c) $Q_3 = \mathbb{Q}_1 *_{\mathbb{Q}_0} \mathbb{Q}_1$
- (d) *for* $\ell = 0,1,2$ *we have* $\underset{\sim}{D}_\ell$ *is a* Q_ℓ*-name of an ultrafilter on* ω
- (e) *for* $\ell = 1,2$ *we have* $\Vdash_{Q_\ell}$ "$\underset{\sim}{D}_0 \subseteq \underset{\sim}{D}_\ell$".

Then we can find a $\mathbb{Q}_3$*-name* $\underset{\sim}{D}$ *such that* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_3}$ "$\underset{\sim}{D}$ *is an ultrafilter on* ω *extending* $\underset{\sim}{D}_1 \cup \underset{\sim}{D}_2$.

Proof. As in [Sh 326, §3]. $\square_{7.5,5.17}$

7.6 Claim. *Let* $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ *and for* $\beta \in (0,\alpha)$ *let* $\underset{\sim}{\nu}_\beta$ *be the generic real of* $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$. *Then* $\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})}$ *can be computed from* $\langle \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}_0}\rangle\hat{\ }\langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_\beta : \beta \in (0,\alpha)\rangle$.

Proof. As usual (or see [Sh 592]).

§8 On η is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M

8.1 Definition. 1) Let $\mathbf{T} = \{\mathscr{T} : \mathscr{T} \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\mathscr{H}(\aleph_0), \mathscr{T} \neq \emptyset, \mathscr{T}$ closed under initial segments, no $\triangleleft$-maximal member and $\mathscr{T}_n = \{\eta \in \mathscr{T} : \ell g(\eta) = n\}$ finite for $n < \omega\}$.

2) For $\mathscr{T}_1, \mathscr{T}_2 \in \mathbf{T}$ let $\mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}_1,\mathscr{T}_2} = \{R : R$ a closed subset of $\lim(\mathscr{T}_1) \times \lim(\mathscr{T}_2)\}$. Similarly for $R_{\mathscr{T}}$.

We write $\eta R_n \nu$ instead of $(\eta, \nu) \in R_n$. We always assume that $\mathscr{T}_1, \mathscr{T}_2$ can be reconstructed from $\bar{R} \in \mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}_1,\mathscr{T}_2}$ and write $\mathscr{T}_1[R], \mathscr{T}_2[R]$; similarly $R \in \mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}}$. Let $\mathbf{R}_* = \cup\{\mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}_1,\mathscr{T}_2} : \mathscr{T}_1, \mathscr{T}_2 \in \mathbf{T}\}$.

3) If R is a closed subset of $\lim(\mathscr{T}_1) \times \lim(\mathscr{T}_2)$ and $k < \omega$ then let $R^{<k>} = \{(\eta \restriction k, \nu \restriction k) : (\nu, \eta) \in R\}$. Similarly for $R \subseteq \lim(\mathscr{T})$.

4) For every $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y} =: \{(f, \mathscr{T}) : \mathscr{T} \in \mathbf{T}, f \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{T}_n)\}$ let $D_{\mathscr{Y}} = \{A \subseteq \omega$: for some $k, m < \omega$ and $(f_\ell, \mathscr{T}_\ell) \in \mathscr{Y}$ and $\nu_\ell \in \lim(T_\ell)$ for $\ell < k$ we have $A \supseteq \{n : n \geq m$ and $\ell < k \Rightarrow \nu_\ell(n) \in f_\ell(n)\}$. We say $\mathscr{Y}$ is nontrivial if $\emptyset \notin D_{\mathscr{Y}}$. Let $J_{\mathscr{Y}}$ be the dual ideal.

8.2 Definition. 1) We say D is $(f, \mathscr{T})$-narrow if:

- (i) $f \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{T}_n)$
- (ii) D is a filter on ω containing the co-finite subsets
- (iii) for every $\nu \in {}^\omega 2$ the set $\{k < \omega : \nu \restriction n \in f(n)\}$ belongs to D.

2) For $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$, we say D is $\mathscr{Y}$-narrow if D is $(f, \mathscr{T})$-narrow for every $(f, \mathscr{T}) \in \mathscr{Y}$.

3) $\mathbf{Z} = \{(\eta, R) : \eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R]), R \in \mathbf{R}_*\}, \mathbf{Z}_M = \{(\eta, R) \in \mathbf{Z} : R \in M$ and $\eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R])\}$.

4) We say that D is (η, R)-big over M if: it is $\{(\eta, R)\}$-big over M (see below).

5) We say that (η, D) is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M if

- (i) M is a set or a class (usually an inner model), D is a filter on ω containing the co-bounded subsets of ω
- (ii) $\mathscr{L} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_M, R \in \mathbf{R}^M_{\mathscr{T}_1 \mathscr{T}_2}, \mathscr{T}_1, \mathscr{T}_2, \mathscr{T} \in \mathbf{T}^M$
- (iii) $\eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R])$ when $\mathscr{L} = \{(\eta, R)\}$ for[7] every $m^* < \omega, \langle \nu_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle \in M, \nu_m \in M$ for $m < m^*, (\eta_m, R_m) \in \mathscr{L}$ such that $\{\nu_{m,n}, \nu_m : n < \omega\} \subseteq \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m])$, if $m < m^* \Rightarrow \nu_m = \lim_D \langle \nu_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle$ then $\{n : m < m^* \Rightarrow \nu_m R_m \eta_m \equiv \nu_{m,n} R_m \eta_m\} \neq \emptyset \mod \in D$.

---

[7] note that if D is an ultrafilter then the case $m^* = 1$ suffices

6) We say η is R-big over M if the filter of co-finite subsets of ω is (η, R)-big. We say that η is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M if (η, D) is with D the filter of co-finite subsets of ω.

8.3 One Step Claim. *Assume (all in* $\mathbf{V}_2$*)*

- (a) $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2$
- (b) *in* $\mathbf{V}_1, D_1$ *is a non principal ultrafilter on* ω
- (c) *for* $\zeta < \zeta_1^*, f_\zeta \in \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{T}_\zeta \in \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{V}_1}$
- (d) D_1 *is* $\mathscr{Y}$*-narrow,* $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ *(of course,* $\mathscr{Y} \in \mathbf{V}_2$*, but possibly* $\mathscr{Y} \notin \mathbf{V}_1$*)*
- (e) $Z \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{V}_1}$
- (f) $(\mathscr{Y}, \mathscr{Z})$ *is high over* $\mathbf{V}_1$ *which means (in* $\mathbf{V}_1$*):* $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{V}_1}, \mathscr{Z} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{V}_2}_{\mathbf{V}_1}$*, and* $m^* < \omega, (\eta_m, R_m) \in \mathscr{Z}$ *for* $m < m^*, \mathscr{Y}' \subseteq \mathscr{Y}$ *is finite,* $B \in (J_{\mathscr{Y}'})^+$ *and for* $m < n^*, \bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_{m,n} : n \in B \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_1$ *and* $\nu_{m,n}, \nu_m \in \lim(\mathscr{T}^1[R_\ell])^{\mathbf{V}_1}, \nu_m = \lim \langle \nu_{m,n} : n \in B \rangle$ *then* $\{n \in B$*: if* $m < m^*$ *then* $\nu_{m,n} R_n \eta_m \equiv \nu R_m \eta_m\}$ *is infinite.*

Then *there is* D_2 *such that:*

- (α) $D_2\, (\in \mathbf{V}_2)$ *is an ultrafitler on* ω
- (β) $D_1 \subseteq D_2$
- (γ) D_2 *is* $\mathscr{Y}$*-narrow over* $\mathbf{V}_1$
- (δ) D_2 *is* $\mathscr{Z}$*-big over* $\mathbf{V}_1$*.*

Remark. Better if we predetermine $D_2 \cap \mathscr{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}}$, good for $\mathfrak{u} = \mathrm{cf}(\alpha^{\mathfrak{q}}) > \aleph_0$.

Proof of 8.3.
For $(f, \mathscr{T}) \in \mathscr{Y}$ and $\rho \in \lim(\mathscr{T})^{\mathbf{V}_2}$ let

$$A^1_{f,\rho} = \{n : \rho(n) \in f(n)\}.$$

For $(\eta, R) \in \mathscr{Z}$ and $\nu_n, \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}[R]) = \mathbf{V}_1$ for $n < \omega$ such that $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_n : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_1$ and $\nu = \lim_D(\bar{\nu})$ we let

$$A^2_{\eta,R,\bar{\nu},\nu} = \{n : \nu_n R \eta \equiv \nu R \eta\}.$$

So we just need to find an ultrafilter D_2 on ω which extends $D_1 \cup \{A^2_{f,\nu} : \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}), (f, \mathscr{T}) \in \mathscr{Y}_1\} \cup \{A^2_{\eta,R,\bar{\nu},\nu} : (\eta, R) \in \mathscr{Z}$ and $\bar{\nu}, \nu \in \mathbf{V}_1$ are as above$\}$. For this it suffices to prove

$(*)$ assume $B \in D_1, n^*_1 < \omega, n^*_2 < \omega, A^1_{f_\ell,\rho_\ell}, A^2_{\eta_n,R_m,\bar{\nu}_m,\nu_m}$ well defined for $\ell < n^*_1, m < n^*_2$ then $B \cap \cap\{A^1_{f_\ell,\rho_\ell} : \ell < n^*_1\} \cap \{A^2_{\eta_m,R_m,\bar{\nu}_m,\nu_m} : m < n^*_2\}$ is non empty where $(f_\ell, \rho_\ell) \in \mathscr{Y}, (\eta_m, R_m) \in \mathscr{Z}$ and $\bar{\nu}_m, \nu_m$ as usual.

As $\nu_m = \lim_D \langle \nu_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle$ and $B \in D_1$ we have $B_{m,k} = \{m \in B : \nu_{m,n} \restriction k = \nu_m \restriction k\} \in D_1$ for $m < n^*_2, k < \omega$ hence $B_k = \bigcap\limits_{m<n^*_2} B_{m,k} \in D_1$ and clearly $B_{k+1} \subseteq B_k$, hence $B_k \neq \emptyset$ mod D hence $B_k \notin J^{\mathbf{V}_1}_{\mathscr{Y}}$, see Definition 8.1(4) where $\mathscr{Y}^* =: \{(f_\ell, \mathscr{T}_\ell) : \ell < n^*_1\}$.

Clearly it suffice to prove that $B \cap \cap\{A^2_{\eta_m,R_m,\bar{\nu}_m,\nu_m} : m < n^*_2\}$ is not in $J_{\mathscr{Y}^*}$. By part (2) of Claim 8.4 below there is $B^* \subseteq B$ in $\mathbf{V}_1$ such that $B^* \backslash B_k$ is finite for $k < \omega$ and $B^* \notin J_{\mathscr{Y}^*}$.

So we have:

$(*)(i)$ $\mathscr{Y}^* \subseteq \mathscr{Y}$ is finite
(ii) $B^* \subseteq \omega$ is from $\mathbf{V}_1, B^* \notin J_{\mathscr{Y}^*}$
(iii) $\nu_m, \nu_{m,n} \in \lim(\mathscr{T}^2[R_m])$ for $m < n^*_2, n < \omega$
(iv) $\nu_m = \lim\langle \nu_{m,n} : n \in B^* \rangle$ for $m < n^*_2$
(v) $\langle \nu_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle$ and ν_m belongs to $\mathbf{V}_1$.

By assumption (f) we are done. $\square_{8.3}$

8.4 Claim. *1) Let $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$, then the following are equivalent for $B \subseteq \omega$:*

(i) $B \notin J_{\mathscr{Y}}$
(ii) *for every $n^* < \omega, (f_\ell, \mathscr{T}_\ell) \in \mathscr{Y}$ for $\ell < n^*$ and $m_0 < \omega$ there is $m_1 \in (m_0, \omega)$ such that:*
    $(*)$ *if $\nu_\ell \in (\mathscr{T}_\ell)_{m_1}$ for $\ell < n^*$ then for some $n \in B \cap [m_0, m_1)$ we have $(\forall \ell < n^*)(\nu_\ell \restriction n \in f_\ell(n))$.*

2) For $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$, if $B_n \in J^+_{\mathscr{Y}}, B_{n+1} \subseteq B_n$ then there is $B \in J^+_{\mathscr{Y}}$ such that $n < \omega \Rightarrow B \subseteq^* B_n$.
3) If $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2, \mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{V}_1}, \mathscr{Y} \in V_1, A \in \mathscr{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$, then $A \in J^{\mathbf{V}_1}_{\mathscr{Y}} \Leftrightarrow A \in J^{\mathbf{V}_2}_{\mathscr{Y}}$.

Proof. Easy.
1) Assume clause (i), i.e. $B \notin J_{\mathscr{Y}}$; to prove clause (ii) assume toward contradiction that n^* and $\langle (f_\ell, \mathscr{T}_\ell) : \ell < n^* \rangle$ and $m_\ell < \omega$ are as there but there is no $m_1 \in (m_0, \omega)$ such that $(*)$ there holds, so there are $\nu^{m_1}_\ell \in (\mathscr{T}_\ell)_{m_1}$ for $\ell < m^*$ such

that $n \in B \cap [m_0, m_1) \Rightarrow (\exists \ell < n^*)(\nu_\ell \notin f_\ell(n))$. By Konig lemma there are $\nu_\ell \in \text{ Lim}(\mathscr{T}_\ell)$ for $\ell < n^*$ such that $\forall m < \omega, \exists^\infty m_2 < \omega(m < m_1 \ \ \& \ \ m_0 < m_1 \ \ \& \bigwedge\limits_{\ell < n^*} \nu_\ell^{m_2} \restriction m = \nu_\ell \restriction m)$.

Now for each ℓ, by Definition 8.1(4) as $(f_\ell, \mathscr{T}_\ell) \in \mathscr{Y}$, the set $A_\ell =: \{m < \omega : \nu_\ell \restriction m \in f_\ell(m)\} \in D_{\mathscr{Y}}$ hence $A = \bigcap\limits_{\ell < n^*} A_\ell \in D_Y$, but we assume $B \neq \emptyset \bmod D_{\mathscr{Y}}$ hence $A \cap B \neq \emptyset \bmod D_{\mathscr{Y}}$ so there is $m_\ell, m_0 < m \in A \cap Y$. Let $m_1 > m$ be such that $\ell < n^* \Rightarrow \nu_\ell^{m_1} \restriction m = \nu'_\ell \restriction m$ and this m_1 contradicts the choice of $\langle \nu_\ell^{m_1} : \ell < n^* \rangle$. So $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ indeed. The other direction is even easier.
2) Just use clause (ii) of part (i) as the definition. This is straight.
3) Follows using clause (ii) of part (1).

8.5 The limit Claim. *Assume:*

- (a) *δ a limit ordinal*
- (b) *$\langle \mathbf{V}_\zeta : \zeta < \delta \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of inner models*
- (c) *$\mathscr{Y}_\zeta \subseteq \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{V}_\zeta}$ is increasing with ζ*
- (d) *D_ζ is a filter on $\mathscr{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}_\zeta}$, increasing with ζ*
- (e) *D_ζ is disjoint to $J_{\mathscr{Y}}$ for every finite $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathscr{Y}_\zeta$.*

Then $\cup\{D_\zeta : \zeta < \delta\}$ *can be extended to a uniform ultrafilter on ω disjoint to $J_{\cup\{\mathscr{Y}_\zeta : \zeta < \delta\}}$.*

Proof. Easy.

8.6 Definition. 1) Assume $\mathscr{T} \in \mathbf{T}, h \in {}^\omega\omega, \infty = \text{ lim}\langle h(n) : n < \omega \rangle$ and $f \in \prod\limits_{n < \omega} \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{T}_{h(n)})$. We say that "$D$ on ω is $(f, h, \mathscr{T})$-narrow" if

- (a) D is a filter on ω containing the co-bounded subsets
- (b) for every $\nu \in \text{ lim}(\mathscr{T})$, the set $\{n : \nu \restriction h(n) \in f(n)\}$ belongs to D.

2) We say $(f', \mathscr{T}')$ is the translation of $(f, h, \mathscr{T})$ if:

$$\mathscr{T}' = \{\langle \eta \restriction h(m) : m < n \rangle : n < \omega, \eta \in \text{ lim}(\mathscr{T})\},$$

$$f'(n) = \{\langle \eta \restriction h(m) : m \leq n \rangle : \eta \in \text{ lim}(\mathscr{T}) \text{ and } \eta \restriction h(n) \in f(n)\}.$$

8.7 Remark. We may like to have $\mathscr{Y}' \subseteq \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{V}_2}$ is this needed? Helpful.

8.8 Definition. 1) Let for a class $M, \mathfrak{Z}_M$ be the set of $(\eta, \bar{R})$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{R} \in {}^\omega(R^M_*), \mathscr{T}_1[R_n] = \mathscr{T}_1[R_0]$ and $\mathscr{T}_2[R_n] = \mathscr{T}_2[R_0]$ and $\bar{R}$ we let $\mathscr{T}_\ell[\bar{R}] = \mathscr{T}_\ell[R_0]$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) $\eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2)$
- (c) η does $\bar{R}$-cover M, which means $(\forall \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[\bar{R}])^M)(\exists n < \omega)[\nu R_n \eta]$ [return: content with one R].

8.9 Claim. *1) Assume (with* $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_2$*)*

- (a) $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}$
- (b) $\mathscr{L} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{V}_1}$
- (c) $\bar{D}_2 = \langle D_{2,\eta} : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega\rangle, D_{2,\eta}$ *a non principal ultrafilter on* ω *(all in* $\mathbf{V}_2$*)*
- (d) $\langle D_{1,\eta} : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega\rangle \in \mathbf{V}_1$ *where* $D_{1,\eta} = D_{2,\eta} \cap \mathscr{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$
- (e) $D_{2,\eta}$ *is* $\mathscr{L}$*-big ultrafilter over* $\mathbf{V}_1$ *for every* $\eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega$.

Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_2}}$ "η *is* R*-big over* $\mathbf{V}_1[\underset{\sim}{\eta}_{Q_{\bar{D}_2}}]$".

2) Assume (a), (c), (d) above and

- $(b)'$ $(\eta, \bar{R}) \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbf{V}_1}$
- $(e)'$ $D_{2,\eta}$ *is* (η, R_n)*-big ultrafilter when* $\eta \in {}^n\omega$.

Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_2}}$ "$(\eta, \bar{R}) \in \mathfrak{Z}_{\mathbf{V}_1[\underset{\sim}{\eta}[Q_{\bar{D}_2}]]}$".

Proof. [Saharon revised: copied from 5.6(2).

1) By **?** this is a special case of part (2). So assume that $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}, m^* < \omega$ and

—> scite{p.7a} undefined

for each $m < m^*, (\rho_m, R_m) \in \mathscr{L}$ and $\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m, \langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_n : n < \omega\rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ are $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{V}}_{\bar{D}}$-names hence $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}$-names such that

$(*)_1$ $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m, \underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_n \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m])$ and $\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m = \lim\langle \underset{\sim}{\nu}_m : n < \omega\rangle$".

By the definition and what we need to prove, without loss of generality

$(*)_2$ $p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m \restriction n = \underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_n \restriction n$".

We shall find $p' \geq p$ in $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}_1}$ such that $p' \Vdash$ “$(\nu^m_n R_m \rho_m) \equiv (\nu^m R_m \rho_m)$ for every $m < \omega$; for some $n < \omega$”, this suffice (see 4.6(2)); work in $\mathbf{V}$. Let $q_0 = ({}^{\omega >}\omega)$, so $q_0 \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$, now we find $\langle \nu^m_\eta, \nu^m_{n,\eta} : \eta \in q_0, n < \omega \rangle$ of course in $\mathbf{V}$ such that:

$(*)_3(i)$ $\nu^m_\eta, \nu^m_{n,\eta} \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m]), m < m^*$

(ii) for every $\eta \in q_0$ and $k < \omega$ we can find $q^m_{\eta,k}, q^m_{n,\eta,k} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ such that:
$q_0^{[\eta]} \leq_{\rm pr} q^m_{\eta,k}, q_0^{[\eta]} \leq_{\rm pr} q^m_{n,\eta,k}$
$q^m_{\eta,k} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m \restriction k = \nu^m_\eta \restriction k$”
$q^m_{n,\eta,k} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_n \restriction k = \nu^m_{n,\eta} \restriction k$”.

Now clearly

$(*)_4$(i) $\nu^m_\eta = \lim_{D_\eta} \langle \nu^m_{\eta\hat{\ }<k>} : k < \omega \rangle$

(ii) $\nu^m_{n,\eta} = \lim_{D_\eta} \langle \nu^m_{n,\eta\hat{\ }<k>\rangle} : k < \omega \rangle$.

Next note that

$(*)_5$ $\nu^m_\eta = \lim \langle \nu^m_{n,\eta} : n < \omega \rangle$.
[Why by $(*)_2$ let $u_\eta = \{m < m^* : \nu^m_\eta R_m \rho_m$ holds$\}$.

Now as each R_m is closed (see Definition 8.1(2)) there is $k_\eta < \omega$ such that

$(*)_6$ if $m < m^*, m \notin u_\eta$ and $\nu^m_\eta \restriction k \triangleleft \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m]), \rho_m \restriction k \triangleleft \rho \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R])$
then $\neg(\nu R_m \rho)$.

By $(*)_4(i) + (ii) + (*)_6$ we have

$(*)_7(i)$ if $\neg(\nu^m_\eta R_m \rho_m)$ implies $\{k < \omega : \nu^m_{\eta\hat{\ }\langle k \rangle} R_m \rho_m\} \notin D_\eta$

(ii) if $\neg(\nu^m_{n,\eta} R_m \rho_m)$ implies $\{k < \omega : \nu^m_{n,\eta\hat{\ }\langle k \rangle} R_m \rho_m\} \notin D_\eta$.

By the assumption on $D_{1,\eta}$ and $(*)_4(i) + (ii)$ we have

$(*)_8(i)$ $\nu^m_\eta R_m$ iff $\{k < \omega : \nu^m_{\eta\hat{\ }\langle k \rangle} R_m \rho_m\} \in D_\eta$

(ii) $\nu^m_{n,m} R_m \rho_m$ iff $\{k : \nu^m_{n,\eta\hat{\ }\langle k \rangle} R_m \rho_m$ holds$\} \in D_\eta$.

By $(*)_5$ applied to $\eta = {\rm tr}(p)$, we can find $n(*) < \omega$ such that $(\forall m < m^*)[(\nu^m_\eta R_m \rho_m) \equiv (\nu^m_{n(*),\eta} R_m \rho_m)]$. Next let

$$p^* =: \{\nu \in p : \text{if } \ell g(r(p)) \leq \ell \leq \ell g(\nu) \text{ and } m < m^* \text{ then } \nu^m_{\nu \restriction \ell} R_m \rho_m \equiv \nu^m_{n(*),\nu \restriction \ell} R_m \rho_m\}.$$

Now $p \leq_{\rm pr} q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar D}$ by $(*)_8$. Lastly, let $q^* =: \{\nu \in p^* : \text{if } \ell < \ell g(\nu), \underline{\text{then}}\ \nu \in q^m_{\nu \restriction \ell, k_\eta}$ and $\nu \in q^m_{n(*),\nu \restriction \ell, k_\eta}\}$.

Does $q^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}}$ "$(\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m R_m \rho_m) \equiv (\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_{n(*)} R_m \rho_m)$"? If not, then for some q^{**} we have $q^* \leq q^{**}$ and $q^{**} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_1}}$ "$(\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m R_m \rho_m) \equiv \neg(\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_{n(*)} R_m \rho_m)$"; moreover, without loss of generality for some truth value $\mathbf{t}, q^{**} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_2}}$ "$(\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m R_m \rho_m) \equiv \mathbf{t}$ and $(\underset{\sim}{\nu}^n_{n(*)} R_m \rho_m) \equiv \neg \mathbf{t}$" and for some $k^* < \omega, q^{**} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar D_2}}$ "$\mathbf{t} = \text{false} \Rightarrow (\forall \nu, \rho)[\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m \restriction k^* \trianglelefteq \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m])\ \&\ \rho_m \restriction k^* \triangleleft \rho \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R_m]) \rightarrow (\nu, \rho) \notin R_m$ and $\neg \mathbf{t} = \text{false} \Rightarrow (\forall \nu, \rho)[\underset{\sim}{\nu}^m_{n(*)} \restriction k^* \triangleleft \nu \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m])\ \&\ \rho_m \restriction k^* \triangleleft \rho \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R_m]) \rightarrow (\nu, \rho) \notin R_m]$. But $q^{**}, q^m_{{\rm tr}(q^{**}),k^*}, q^m_{n(*),{\rm tr}(q^{**}),k^*}$ for $m < m^*$ are compatible having the same trunk, so let q' be a common upper bound with ${\rm tr}(q'') = {\rm tr}(q^{**})$ and we get a contradiction.
2) Return! $\square_{8.9}$

8.10 Definition. 1) For $g \in \mathscr{G}$ let

$$\mathscr{T}[g] = {}^{\omega >}2$$

$$\mathscr{T}_2[g] = \{\langle T \cap {}^{g(\ell)}2 : \ell < n \rangle : T \in \mathbf{T}_g, n < \omega\},$$

so $\eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[g])$ can be identified with

$$T = T[\eta] \in \mathbf{T}_g : \eta = \eta_T = \big\langle \langle T \cap {}^{\ell \geq}2 : \ell < n \rangle : n < \omega \big\rangle$$

$$R_g = \{(\eta, \nu) : \nu \in {}^{\omega >}2, \eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[g]) \text{ and } \nu \in \lim(T[\eta])\}.$$

2) Let $\bar w^* = \langle w^*_k : k < \omega \rangle$ list with no repetition $\cup\{\mathscr{P}({}^n 2) \backslash \{\emptyset\} : n < \omega\}$ such that $w^*_\ell \in {}^{{\rm les}[w^*]}2, \ell_1 < \ell_2 \Rightarrow {}^{\rm les}[w^*_{\ell_1}] \leq [w^*_{\ell_2}]$ and $\ell_1 < \ell_2\ \&\ {\rm les}[w^*_{\ell_1}] = {\rm les}[w^*_{\ell_2}] \Rightarrow$ the $<_{\rm lex}$-first ρ such that $\rho \in w^*_{\ell_1} \equiv \rho \notin w^*_{\ell_2}$ satisfies $\rho \in w^*_\ell$. Let it be defined as $\mathscr{T}^0 = {}^{\omega >}2$ and $h^*(\ell) = n[w^*_\ell]$. $\square_{8.10}$

The following shows that the "$\mathscr{G}$-continuous" treated in §4-§6 fit our present framework.

8.11 Claim. *1) Assume $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2, g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}_1}, \mathbf{r} \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}_2}$, $\underline{\text{then}}$ we have: $\mathbf{r}$ is $\{g\}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}_1$ iff $\mathbf{r}$ is R_g-big over $\mathbf{V}_1$.*
2) Assume:

- (a) $\mathbf{V}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}$
- (b) $\mathscr{X} \subseteq \{(\mathbf{r}, R_g) : g \in \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}_1}, \mathbf{r} \in ({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ *and* $\mathbf{r}$ *is* R_g*-big over* $\mathbf{V}_1\}$.

Then $\mathscr{Y} = \emptyset$ *and* $\mathscr{X}$ *are as required in 8.3, i.e.* $(\mathscr{Y}, \mathscr{L})$ *is high over* $\mathbf{V}_1$ *(i.e. clause (f) there).*
3) Assume (a), (b) as in (2) and

(c) $\mathscr{Y} = \{(\bar{w}, h^*, \mathscr{Y}^0_*)\}$.

Then $(\mathscr{Y}, \mathscr{X})$ *are as required in 8.3.*

Proof. (Or use $\mathscr{X}$ with R^1, see later).
1) Compare the definition 4.5(1) + (3) and 8.2(3).
2) So assume $m^* < \omega$ and $(\eta_m, R_m) \in \mathscr{L}$ for $m < m^*$ and $B \subseteq \omega$ is infinite and $\nu_m, \nu_{m,n} \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R_m]), \langle \nu_{m,n} : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_1$ and $\nu_m = \lim \langle \nu_{m,n} : n \in B \rangle$ for $m < m^*$. We should prove that $\{n \in B : \text{if } m < m^* \text{ then } \nu_m R_m \eta \equiv \nu_{m,n} R_m \eta\}$ is infinite.
3) Left to the reader.

GLOSSARY

§1 Trunk Controller

1.1 (Definition) Trunk controller, standard (trunk control), $\aleph_1$-complete based, fully based, $\mathscr{F}^{[\beta]}$, trivial, transparent

1.2 (Definition) (A trunk controller $\mathscr{F}$ is) simple (= purely regressively $\aleph_2$-c.c. on S^2_1), semi-simple (= $\aleph_2$-c.c. for pure extensions), (semi) simply based (all are simple (except the first is semi simple)

1.6 (Definition) $\mathscr{F}$-forcing

1.7 (Definition) (An $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ is) clear (help put together extensions) basic, straight (help put together $p_\ell \le_{apr} q_\ell, p_q \le_{pr} p_2$, (used in 3.1(1)) and transparent

1.9 (Definition) $\mathscr{F}$-iteration

1.11 (Claim) $\mathrm{Lim}_{\mathscr{F}}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ is a $\mathscr{F}$-forcing

1.12 (Claim) in a $\mathscr{F}$-iteration, $\beta < \gamma \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\beta \lessdot P_\gamma$ naturally

1.13 (Claim) Preservation of clear (+ variant) and straight

1.14 (Claim) Simplicity of $\mathscr{F}+$ clearly of the $\mathscr{F}$-forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ impure (pure) $\aleph_2$-c.c. (+ variants)

1.15 (Claim) Existence of $\mathscr{F}$-iteration

1.16 (Claim) Associativity (of $\mathscr{F}$-iterations)

1.17 (Discussion)

1.18 (Definition) Pure decidability

§2 Being $\mathscr{F}$-pseudo c.c.c. ($\mathscr{F}$-psc) is preserved by $\mathscr{F}$-iterations

2.1 (Definition) $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc, $(\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{P})$-psc, clear, straight; consider $(\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{P})$

2.2 (Definition) $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-psc iteration as witnessed by $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$, is essentially ... (except Q_0), semi-simple $\mathscr{F}$-psc strong

2.4 (Definition) $\mathbb{Q}$ is strong $\mathscr{F}$, psc, $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ is strong

2.5 (Claim) Sufficient conditions for psc

2.6 (Definition) $\mathscr{F}$ is psc, strongly psc; cont, Knaster, explicite, semi

2.7 (Claim) Implications

2.8 (Claim) Basic fact on the explicit version

2.9 (Claim) F-psc implies pure $(\infty, \aleph_1)$-decidability for $\aleph_0$ anmes; the strong version and the explicit version implies purely proper

2.10 (Remark) On "straight" and on stationary $\mathscr{S} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$

2.11 (Remark) On $\aleph_1$-completeness

2.12 (Lemma) Preserving psc under $\mathscr{F}$-iteration

2.13 (Claim) Preserving the explicit version under $\mathscr{F}$-iteration

2.15 (Definition) $(\mathscr{H}, <_{\mathscr{H}})$ is a c.c.c. witness

4.2 $\mathbf{T}_g$

4.3 $T = \lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle, \mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}, \mathscr{B} = ms - \lim_D \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega \rangle$

8.5 ρ is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over N (for D), $\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G},D}$

§3 Nicer pure properness and pure decidability

3.1 (Claim) Sufficient conditions for pure decidability

3.2 (Claim) Purely properness

§4 Averages by an ultrafitler and restricted non null set

4.1 (Definition) For $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{r}], \mathbf{r}$ random over $\mathbf{V}_1$, we consider extending an ultrafilter D on ω from $\mathbf{V}$ to an ultrafilter D_1 on ω from $\mathbf{V}$ relevant to the randomness of $\mathbf{r}$.

4.2 (Definition) We define $\mathbf{T}_g$ as the set of $T \subseteq {}^{\omega >}2$ whose convergence to their Lebesgue measure is bounded by g.

4.3 (Definition) We define $T = \lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle, \mathscr{G}^v$ and $\mathscr{B} =$ ms-$\lim_D \langle \mathscr{B}_n : n < \omega \rangle$.

4.4 (Claim) We note obvious things on $\lim_D \langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle$.

4.5 (Definition) We define "ρ is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over N for D", the ideal $\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G},D}$ and $\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G}}$.

4.6 (Observation) If $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbf{V}_1, ({}^{\omega}2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ not in $(\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G}})^{\mathbf{V}_1}$ then $\mathbf{V}_1$ has no Cohen over $\mathbf{V}$ and the ultrafilter over 4.5.

4.7 (Conclusion) We can extend an ultrafilter $D \in \mathbf{V}$ to an ultrafilter D_1 in $\mathbf{V}_1$ preserving "$\mathbf{r}$ is $\mathscr{G}$-continuous over $\mathbf{V}$".

§5 On $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ and iterations

5.1 (Definition) We define $\bar{D} \in \mathbf{IF}, \bar{D} \in \mathbf{IUF}(\bar{D} = \langle D_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\omega \rangle, D_\eta$ a filter or ultrafilter on ω (non principle).

5.2 (Definition) $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$, a forcing notion, for $\bar{D} \in \mathbf{IF}, \underset{\sim}{\eta} = \underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}})$, the generic.

5.3 (Fact) For $\bar{D} \in \mathbf{IUF}, \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ is straight, clear, simple, σ-centered purely proper, $\mathscr{F}$-psc forcing when ${}^{\omega >}\omega \subseteq \mathscr{F}$, with $\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{D}_{\bar{D}})$ a generic real.

5.4 (Claim) On 2-pure decidability fronts and absoluteness for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_D$.

5.5 (Claim) New $f \in {}^\omega\omega$ run away from old on Rang$[\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}})]$

5.6 (Claim) (1) On $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}} \lessdot \mathbb{P} * \mathbb{Q}_{\underset{\sim}{\bar{D}}}$, when $D_\eta \leq \underset{\sim}{D}'_\eta$.
(2) Preserving $\underset{\sim}{G}$-continuity.

5.7 (Claim) On new $f \in \prod\limits_n^{\underset{\sim}{\eta}(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}})(n)} 2$ running away from old $\rho \in {}^\omega 2$

5.9 (Claim) For $D \cup f$ on ω, when does $\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}$ satisfy: in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}, w_n \subseteq [\underset{\sim}{\eta}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}(n), \underset{\sim}{\eta}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}(n)], |w_n| \leq \eta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}(n)$ then $\cup\{w_n : n < \omega\}$ is disjoint to some member of D.

5.10 (Hypothesis) $(CH + \mathscr{F}^* + \mathfrak{K}(0)$, with Lim$(\bar{R})$ - c.c.c.

5.11 (Definition) Of $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha, \mathfrak{K}$.

5.12 (Definition) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_2$.

5.14 (Definition) $ir(\mathbb{Q})$, set of $\mathfrak{p}$ giving an autonomous description of a condition in the iteration

5.15 (Definition) We define $\mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ for the content above.

5.16 (Remark)

5.17 (Observation) Collect the properties, not used.

§6 On a relative of Borel conjecture with large $\mathfrak{b}$

6.1 (Hypothesis)

6.2 (Definition) (1) We fix $\mathfrak{K}(0)$,the candidates for first forcing in the iterations as adding λ-randoms and define $A(Q_0)$.
(2) $\mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ in this content.
(3) $\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha, \mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha}$; mainly $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \restriction \beta \in \mathfrak{K}^+_\beta$ for $\beta < \alpha, \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'_\alpha$ but for $\alpha \geq \lambda, Q_0$ has all random and they look internally a Sierpinski such that if $\alpha < \lambda$ has $< \lambda$ randoms.
(4) $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{K}'_\alpha}$ (the first new random is $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$-continuous over the (mainly smaller

forcing).
(5) $\mathfrak{K}''_\alpha$ (mainly $\subseteq \mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$).

6.4 (Observation) (1) The Sierpinski-ness of the randoms.
(2) Essentially $\mathscr{F}$-psc with 2-pure decidability over Q_0.
(3) Semi-simple + .

6.5 (Claim) Existence of extensions and appear bound of increasing sequences for $\mathfrak{K}'_{\leq\alpha}, \mathfrak{K}''_{\leq\alpha}$.

6.6 (Conclusion) We get $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}_\alpha$ with $\alpha < \lambda$, using λ or less of the randoms manipulating $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{d}$ covering number for ?

6.7 (Claim) Similar to 6.6, for $\alpha = \lambda^+$.

§7 Continuing [Sh 592]

7.2 (Theorem) We find a forcing as in [Sh 592] replacing the null ideal by $\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G}}$ but with $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d}$ is quite small, e.g. in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$, $\mathrm{cov}(\mathrm{Null}_{\mathscr{G}}) = \aleph_\omega, \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \aleph_2$.

7.3 (Remark) Connection to [Sh 619].

7.4 (Claim) Amalgamation in $\mathfrak{K}^+_\alpha$ or above an amalgamation in $\mathfrak{K}(0)$.

7.5 (Claim) The fact needed for the induction step in 5.17 putting two ultrafilters together over amalgamated forcings.

7.6 (Claim) The generic real for $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \mathfrak{K}'_{\ell,\alpha}$ are enough.

§8 On "η is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M"

8.1 (Definition) (1) We define $\mathbf{T}$, the set of finitary trees $\subseteq {}^{\omega>}\mathscr{H}(\aleph_0)$.
(2) $\mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}_1,\mathscr{T}_2}$ is the set of closed subsets of $\mathrm{Lim}(\mathscr{T}_2)$; also $\mathbf{R}_{\mathscr{T}}, \mathbf{R}_\alpha$ and $\subseteq \lim(\mathscr{T}_1[R]) \times \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R])$.
(3) $R^{<k>}$.
(4) $\mathbf{Y}$ is a set of $(f, \mathscr{T}), D_Y$ for $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$.

8.2 (Definition) (1) D is $(f, \mathscr{T})$-narrow for $f \in \pi\{\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{T}_n) : n < \omega\}$.
(2) D is $\mathscr{Y}$-narrow.
(3) $\mathbf{Z}_M$ set of (η, R) with $R \in M, \eta \in \lim(\mathscr{T}_2[R])$.
(4) D is (η, R)-big over M.
(5) D is $\mathscr{L}$-big over M.
(6) η is R-big or $\mathscr{L}$-big over M.

8.3 (Claim) Sufficient condition for extending the ultrafitler $D_1 \in \mathbf{V}_1$ to $D_2 \in \mathbf{V}_2$ which is $\mathscr{L}$-big, $\mathscr{Y}$-narrow over $\mathbf{V}_1$.

8.4 (Claim) Equivalent condition to $B \notin J_{\mathscr{Y}}$, the narrowness ideal for $\mathscr{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$.

8.5 (Claim) Limit of $\mathscr{Y}_\zeta$-narrow filters which is $\bigcup\limits_\zeta Y_\zeta$-narrow.

8.6 (Definition) $(f, h, \mathscr{T})$-narrow (return?) [releveling $\mathscr{T}$]

8.8 (Definition) $\mathfrak{Z}_\mu$ set of $(\eta, \bar{R})$ (?) [return?]

8.9 (Claim) (1) Extending $\bar{D}$ to preserve such that $\eta \in \mathbf{V}_2$ is R-big on $\mathbf{V}_1[\eta_{\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{D}}}]$.
(2) Similarly for $\mathfrak{Z}$.

8.10 (Definition) (1) Tree of subsets for $\mathbf{T}_g$.
(2) More notation on trees.

8.11 (Claim) (1) $\mathscr{G}$-continuous and R_g-bigness equivalent.
(2) Sufficient conditions for 8.3 for $\mathscr{Y} = G$.
(3) Similarly $\mathscr{Y} \neq \emptyset$ using 8.10(2).

REFERENCES.

[JdSh 321] Jaime Ihoda (Haim Judah) and Saharon Shelah. Δ^1_2-sets of reals. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **42**:207–223, 1989.

[Sh 700] Saharon Shelah. Are $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ your cup of tea? *Acta Mathematica*, **accepted**. `math.LO/0012170`[8]

[Sh 630] Saharon Shelah. Non-elementary proper forcing notions. *Journal of Applied Analysis*, **accepted**. `math.LO/9712283`

[Sh 619] Saharon Shelah. The null ideal restricted to some non-null set may be $\aleph_1$-saturated. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **submitted**. `math.LO/9705213`

[Sh 326] Saharon Shelah. Vive la différence I: Nonisomorphism of ultrapowers of countable models. In *Set Theory of the Continuum*, volume 26 of *Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications*, pages 357–405. Springer Verlag, 1992. `math.LO/9201245`

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.

[Sh 592] Saharon Shelah. Covering of the null ideal may have countable cofinality. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **166**:109–136, 2000. `math.LO/9810181`

---

[8] References of the form `math.XX/···` refer to the `xxx.lanl.gov` archive